

**PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
BULLETIN No. 20**

**PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
SIXTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION**

**OF THE
State Literary and Historical Association
of North Carolina**

**RALEIGH
NOVEMBER 8-9, 1915**

F
251
N95
v.16

x Jackson Library -UNCG
F251 .N95 c.1
State Litera / Proceedings of the ... annual NGUU



v.16

v. 16

3 0510 0723825-

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
SIXTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION
OF THE
State Literary and Historical Association
of North Carolina

RALEIGH
November 8-9, 1915

Compiled by
R. D. W. CONNOR
Secretary

RALEIGH
EDWARDS & BROUGHTON PRINTING CO.
STATE PRINTERS
1916

The North Carolina Historical Commission

J. BRYAN GRIMES, *Chairman*, Raleigh.

W. J. PEELE, Raleigh.

M. C. S. NOBLE, Chapel Hill.

THOMAS M. PITTMAN, Henderson.

D. H. HILL, Raleigh.

R. D. W. CONNOR, *Secretary*, Raleigh.

Officers of the State Literary and Historical Association

1915.

President	CLARENCE POE, Raleigh.
First Vice-President	MISS MINNIE W. LEATHERMAN, Raleigh.
Second Vice-President	J. G. DE R. HAMILTON, Chapel Hill.
Third Vice-President	S. A. ASHE, Raleigh.
Secretary-Treasurer	R. D. W. CONNOR, Raleigh.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(With Above Officers.)

JOHN F. BRUTON, Wilson.	HOWARD RONDTHALER, Winston-Salem.
A. W. MCLEAN, Lumberton.	THOMAS M. PITTMAN, Henderson.
JOHN L. CHAMBERS, Charlotte.	

1916.

President	HOWARD RONDTHALER, Winston-Salem.
First Vice-President	MISS E. A. COLTON, Raleigh.
Second Vice-President	FRANCIS D. WINSTON, Windsor.
Third Vice-President	HENRY A. LONDON, Pittsboro.
Secretary-Treasurer	R. D. W. CONNOR, Raleigh.

PURPOSES OF THE STATE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

"The collection, preservation, production, and dissemination of our State literature and history;

"The encouragement of public and school libraries;

"The establishment of an historical museum;

"The inculcation of a literary spirit among our people;

"The correction of printed misrepresentations concerning North Carolina; and—

"The engendering of an intelligent, healthy State pride in the rising generations."

ELIGIBILITY TO MEMBERSHIP—MEMBERSHIP DUES.

All persons interested in its purposes are invited to become members of the Association. There are two classes of members: "Regular Members," paying one dollar a year, and "Sustaining Members," paying five dollars a year.

RECORD OF THE STATE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

(Organized October, 1900.)

<i>Fiscal Years.</i>	<i>Presidents.</i>	<i>Secretaries.</i>	<i>Paid up Membership.</i>
1900-1901	WALTER CLARK	ALEX. J. FEILD	150
1901-1902	HENRY G. CONNOR	ALEX. J. FEILD	139
1902-1903	W. L. POTEAT.....	GEORGE S. FRAPS	73
1903-1904	C. ALPHONSO SMITH	CLARENCE POE	127
1904-1905	ROBERT W. WINSTON	CLARENCE POE	109
1905-1906	CHARLES B. AYCOCK	CLARENCE POE	185
1906-1907	W. D. PRUDEN	CLARENCE POE	301
1907-1908	ROBERT BINGHAM	CLARENCE POE	273
1908-1909	JUNIUS ADAMS	CLARENCE POE	311
1909-1910	PLATT D. WALKER	CLARENCE POE	440
1910-1911	EDWARD K. GRAHAM	CLARENCE POE	425
1911-1912	R. D. W. CONNOR	CLARENCE POE	479
1912-1913	W. P. FEW	R. D. W. CONNOR	476
1913-1914	ARCHIBALD HENDERSON	R. D. W. CONNOR	435
1914-1915	CLARENCE POE	R. D. W. CONNOR	412
1915-1916	HOWARD RONDTHALER	R. D. W. CONNOR	—

AWARDS OF THE PATTERSON MEMORIAL CUP.

- 1905—JOHN CHARLES MCNEILL, for poems later reprinted in book form as "Songs, Merry and Sad." (Presentation by Theodore Roosevelt.)
- 1906—EDWIN MIMS, for "Life of Sidney Lanier." (Presentation by Fabius H. Busbee.)
- 1907—KEMP PLUMMER BATTLE, for "History of the University of North Carolina." (Presentation by Francis D. Winston.)
- 1908—SAMUEL A'COURT ASHE, for "History of North Carolina." (Presentation by Thomas Nelson Page.)
- 1909—CLARENCE POE, for "A Southerner in Europe." (Presentation by James Bryce.)
- 1910—R. D. W. CONNOR, for "Cornelius Harnett: An Essay in North Carolina History." (Presentation by T. W. Bickett.)
- 1911—ARCHIBALD HENDERSON, for "George Bernard Shaw: His Life and Works." (Presentation by Lee S. Overman.)
- 1912—CLARENCE POE, for "Where Half the World is Waking Up." (Presentation by Walter H. Page.)
- 1913—HORACE KEPHART, for "Our Southern Highlanders." (Presentation by Maurice G. Fulton.)
- 1914—J. G. DER. HAMILTON, for "Reconstruction in North Carolina." (Presentation by W. K. Boyd.)
- 1915—WILLIAM LOUIS POTEAT, for "The New Peace." (Presentation by Josephus Daniels.)

WHAT THE ASSOCIATION HAS ACCOMPLISHED FOR THE STATE—
SUCCESSFUL MOVEMENTS INAUGURATED BY IT.

1. Rural libraries.
2. "North Carolina Day" in the schools.
3. The North Carolina Historical Commission.
4. Vance Statue in Statuary Hall (to be erected soon).
5. Fire-proof State Library Building and Hall of Records.
6. Civil War battlefields marked to show North Carolina's record.
7. North Carolina's war record defended and war claims vindicated.
8. The Patterson Memorial Cup.
9. Lecture Extension Work started in leading cities and towns.
10. A program of Library Extension Work begun.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
MINUTES OF SIXTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION	7
A Western View of Tradition. By Franklin K. Lane	12
The North Carolina of Tomorrow. By Clarence Poe	20
Can Democracy be Organized? By Edwin A. Alderman	31
Social and Economic Legislation in North Carolina during the Civil War. By E. W. Sikes.	42
Union Sentiment in North Carolina during the Civil War By Miss Mary Shannon Smith	50
The Southern Policy of Andrew Johnson. By J. G. deR. Hamilton..	65
Thomas Jordan Jarvis and the Rebuilding of North Carolina. By Henry Groves Connor	81
North Carolina Bibliography for 1915. By Miss Minnie W. Leatherman.	98
A State Art Commission. By W. C. A. Hammel	102
MEMBERS FOR 1915-1916.	114

MINUTES

Proceedings and Addresses of the State Literary and Historical Association

RALEIGH, NOVEMBER 8-9, 1915

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8TH.

The Sixteenth Annual Session of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina was called to order in the City Auditorium, Raleigh, N. C., Monday evening, November 8, 1915, at 8:30 o'clock, with President Poe in the chair. At the request of President Poe, Rev. Dr. I. McK. Pittenger opened the session with prayer. President Poe then presented Hon. Josephus Daniels who introduced to the audience the speaker of the evening, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, in the following words:¹

It has become the fixed habit—and a very good habit—of this Association to have as orator, each recurring annual meeting, some man of national or international reputation. We have drawn from England and France and Argentina distinguished ambassadors quite as famed in the field of literature as in diplomacy. There have come to us distinguished statesmen trained in different schools of political thought, for here is a forum where difference of opinion and discussion are welcomed. Ex-President Roosevelt, a product of the best culture of the Empire State, and Thomas Nelson Page, the best interpreter and exponent of Southern life, have been equally welcomed. A few years ago we had the honor of welcoming Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Senator from Massachusetts, whose distinction as a man of letters is not second to the high place he holds in the United States Senate, distinguished son of New England. He called to the support of these ancient decrees the traditions of the earlier days of the Republic and strengthened the faith of those whose bump of veneration for the elder statesmen dominates them. He voiced the scholastic and conservative sentiment of the old school thought of New England, of which he himself is one of the finest products. Every man who rises to distinction must bring forth the spirit of his community. No great man must be hampered by his environment, but he is the living expression of the spirit of the section from which he hails. If you did not know anything about the history of New England and of Harvard, and you were to read Senator Lodge's books and hear his finished orations, you would understand what the culture of New England does for a man. You would catch its very spirit. I mean, of course, the spirit of the old New England stock. When Senator Lodge was with us he spoke out of the largeness of his knowledge and out of his inherent and deep-seated conservatism, warning against the danger of departing from the ways of the fathers. He believes that the Constitution, as expounded by Hamilton and Madison, though holding to the Hamilton view, is the last word in political wisdom. The traditions of the elders were never enforced with more ability than by him.

¹Reprinted from the report in the *News and Observer*, November 9, 1915.

Tonight we have with us as the speaker a gentleman who incarnates the briefer traditions of the Far West; who as a boy saw the development of the mighty Empire State of the Pacific. He caught the spirit of the pioneer, whose creed is to regard the traditions of the past as a light, but not as an unerring light. He is a type of what the old-time New Englander would call "the educated pioneer," a man who has more veneration for the sturdy pioneers who braved the perils of the desert and the floods to carry the new civilization to the far West, than he venerates any other traditions. He is versed in the story learning of past generations; he knows that history often repeats itself; he is a philosopher and a thinker and an artist in expression; but first and last he is a product of that newer Americanism which looks to the fathers only for lessons that will help the son outstrip the father. To Senator Lodge the referendum, the initiative, the recall, the election of Senators by the people—and like measures giving larger share in popular government—are revolutionary. The New England Senator shudders lest this breezy Western Democracy will unsettle the foundations of the Republic. Our speaker tonight welcomes them as opening larger doors for men of a new generation, and, instead of shrinking from the perils of Democracy, believes that the only way to cure the ills of Democracy is more Democracy. The New England school of thought would hold on to ancient prerogative, lest in removing it important principles should be destroyed. Our speaker tonight holds with Tennyson that he is a true conservative "who lops the moldering branch away." When you hear tonight of Western traditions, of the necessity of adapting ancient principles to the need of this living, moving, changing life of today, you will hear it in the language of a master of style, but you will also hear it from one who has himself been in the arena, and fought for the New Freedom unhampered by tradition—a new dispensation that is the hope of the Republic.

If I were introducing your speaker of this evening to an audience in any State except North Carolina, I would recount that brilliant page in his history when, upon the occasion of the San Francisco fire, he, surrounded by a few other heroic spirits, with a courage never excelled at Thermopylae or Gettysburg, led the movement which brought order out of chaos, and saved a portion of San Francisco. I would speak of his devotion to civic righteousness which made him the leader in the fight against graft and domination of politics by bosses and selfish machines. I would recount how, as Democratic candidate for Governor of California, he chose rather to be defeated than to make terms with privilege or selfish interest. I would point to his record as Interstate Commerce Commissioner, where after patient investigation he held the public service corporations to strict compliance with the law, compelled the express companies to reduce exorbitant rates, and was unmoved either by the representative of corporations or the clamor of the demagogue. I would speak of him as scholar, all of whose productions in style and manner and matter make literature. But I am speaking here about him tonight to my home folks and friends, and therefore I wish to speak of him simply as a man, sunny-tempered, who feels with Homer "I am a man, whatever concerns man interests me," as a golden-hearted gentleman, without fear and without reproach, who loves his friends and who is known and loved by them. One of the greatest pleasures that has come to me in the new life I have led in Washington is to have had the close official and personal contact with your orator of tonight. If nothing else had come to

me in official life, the intimacy with your speaker and the happiness of winning the friendship of Franklin K. Lane would have been enough.

I have the great pleasure of presenting to my home people tonight my warm personal friend, Franklin K. Lane, the best product that California has given to the Republic.

Mr. Lane then addressed the Association on "A Western View of Tradition." At the conclusion of Mr. Lane's address President Poe announced the award of the William Houston Patterson Memorial Cup for 1915 to Dr. William L. Poteat, for his book, "The New Peace," and the cup was presented to Dr. Poteat, on behalf of the Association, by Mr. Josephus Daniels. At the conclusion of the program the members of the Association gathered at the Governor's Mansion where they were tendered a reception by the Caswell-Nash Chapter, D. A. R., of Raleigh.

TUESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 9TH.

The session was called to order in the Hall of the House of Representatives by President Poe, at 10 o'clock. President Poe presented Dr. E. W. Sikes, Professor of History in Wake Forest College, who read a paper on "Social and Economic Legislation in North Carolina During the Civil War." Dr. Sikes was followed by Miss Mary Shannon Smith, Professor of History and Education in Meredith College, who read a paper on "Union Sentiment in North Carolina During the Civil War." Miss Smith was followed by Dr. J. G. deR. Hamilton, Professor of History at the University of North Carolina, who read a paper entitled "The South and the Administration of Andrew Johnson." At the conclusion of Dr. Hamilton's paper, the President announced that the paper on "Thomas Jordan Jarvis and the Rebuilding of North Carolina," by Hon. H. G. Connor, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina, in the absence of Judge Connor would be read by the Secretary.

The President announced the appointment of the following committees:

Committee on Resolutions: Thomas W. Lingle, W. F. Marshall, W. K. Boyd, W. C. A. Hammel, and Mrs. E. E. Moffitt.

Committee on Nominations: E. K. Graham, Mrs. H. A. London, F. P. Hobgood, J. L. Chambers, and Miss Mary Shannon Smith.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, NOVEMBER 9TH.

The State Literary and Historical Association met in the Hall of the House of Representatives, at 2:30 o'clock, in joint session with the North Carolina Folk Lore Society. Dr. D. H. Hill, Vice-President of the Folk Lore Society, presided. At the conclusion of the program of the Folk Lore Society, the Literary and Historical Association, with President Poe in the chair, concluded the program with the following papers:

"Bibliography of North Carolina for 1915," by Miss Minnie W. Leatherman, Secretary of the North Carolina Library Commission.

"Literature and Art: Two Means of Expressing the Genius of a People," by Benjamin Sledd, Wake Forest College.

"A State Art Commission," by W. C. A. Hammel, State Normal and Industrial College.

At the conclusion of Mr. Hammel's paper, the Committee on Resolutions submitted the following report which, after discussion, was adopted:

Resolved:

1. That the State Literary and Historical Association urge legislation by the General Assembly looking to the establishment of a State Art Commission at the earliest possible date.

2. That the Association give its formal and hearty endorsement to the movement looking to an appropriate celebration of the tercentenary of William Shakespeare, the greatest name in world literature, and offer to assist Mrs. Lindsay Patterson and other leaders in the movement in North Carolina in any reasonable manner.

3. That the Association lend its hearty support to Congressman Pou in his effort to secure legislation by Congress providing for a national memorial to Andrew Johnson, son of North Carolina, patriot, statesman, and friend of the Union and of the South, and that all reasonable effort be made to have this memorial located in the city of Raleigh near the statesman's birthplace.

4. That the Association appoint a committee to consider the advisability and practicability of having erected in the Capitol a tablet bearing the names of those writers of Colonial and Revolutionary times, through whose efforts the history of North Carolina has been preserved.

5. That the Association endorse the action of the United Daughters of the Confederacy by commending to the North Carolina Historical Commission the propriety of appropriately marking the house near Winchester, Virginia, wherein died those two distinguished North Carolina soldiers, Generals Stephen B. Ramseur and Johnston Pettigrew.

6. That the Association express its thanks to the press of the State that has given publicity to the program and the work of the Association.

7. That the Association acknowledge its high appreciation of the reception tendered the members of the Association at the Governor's Mansion by the Caswell-Nash Chapter, D. A. R.

8. That the Association likewise acknowledge its indebtedness to the authorities of Meredith College for the use of its auditorium and for all courtesies extended the Association and its members.

Respectfully submitted,

THOS. W. LINGLE,
W. F. MARSHALL,
W. K. BOYD,
W. C. A. HAMMEL,
MRS. E. E. MOFFITT,

Committee on Resolutions.

It was moved and carried that a committee, consisting of the President and four others, to be selected by the President, be appointed to draft and report to the next session of this Association a bill looking toward the creation of a State Art Commission, which, when approved by this Association, shall be submitted to the General Assembly of 1917.

The meeting then adjourned.

TUESDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 9TH.

The Literary and Historical Association met in the auditorium of Meredith College, at 8:30 o'clock, with President Poe in the chair. President Poe delivered the President's annual address on "The North Carolina of Tomorrow," after which he presented Dr. Edwin A. Alderman, President of the University of Virginia, who addressed the Association on "Can Democracy be Organized?" At the conclusion of Dr. Alderman's address the Committee on Nominations submitted the following report which was unanimously adopted:

President, Howard Rondthaler, Winston-Salem.
First Vice-President, Miss Elizabeth A. Colton, Raleigh.
Second Vice-President, Francis D. Winston, Windsor.
Third Vice-President, H. A. London, Pittsboro.
Secretary-Treasurer, R. D. W. Connor, Raleigh.

The meeting was then adjourned *sine die*.

ADDRESSES

A Western View of Tradition

BY FRANKLIN K. LANE.

Measured in miles it is a long way from California to North Carolina. Yet in these days, when one can talk by wire, and even by wireless, from sea to sea, such standard of measurement seems to be of the past, and we must look for other ways in which to express the distances that lie between us, if in fact we are separated at all. Men are really divided by differences in sympathies and standpoint, not by miles, and I have thought that you, living in this older commonwealth of historic greatness and rich with hallowed traditions, might be interested in what may be called a western view of tradition. And perhaps we shall find that South and West are more really words of convenience than words of distinction.

No doubt you sometimes think that we are reckless of the wisdom of our forebears; while we at times have been heard to say that you live too securely in that passion for the past which makes men mellow but unmodern.

When you see the West adopting or urging such measures as presidential primaries, the election of United States Senators by popular vote, the initiative, the referendum and the recall as means supplementary to representative government you shudder, in your dignified way no doubt, at the audacity and irreverence of your crude countrymen. They must be in your eyes as far from grace as that American who visited one of the ancient temples of India. After a long journey through winding corridors of marble, he was brought to a single flickering light set in a jewelled recess in the wall. "And what is this?" said the tourist. "That, sir," replied the guide, "is the sacred fire which was lighted 2,000 years ago and never has been out." "Never been out? What nonsense! Poff! Well, the blamed thing's out now." This wild Westerner doubtless typifies those who without heed and in their hot-headed and fanatical worship of change would destroy the very light of our civilization. But let me remind you that all fanaticism is not radical. There is a fanaticism that is conservative, a reverence for things as they are that is no less destructive. Some years ago I visited a fishing village in Canada peopled by Scotchmen who had immigrated in the early part of the nineteenth century. It was a place named Ingonish in Cape Breton, a rugged spot that looks directly upon the Atlantic at its cruelest point.

One day I fell into talk with a fisherman—a very model of a tawny-haired viking. He told me that from his fishing and his farming he made some \$300 a year. “Why not come over into my country,” I said, “where you may make that in a month?” There came over his face a look of humiliation as he replied, “No, I could not.” “Why not?” I asked. “Because,” said he, brushing his hand across his sea-burnt beard, “because I can neither read nor write.” “And why,” said I, “haven’t you learned? There are schools here.” “Yes, there are schools, but my father could not read or write, and I would have felt that I was putting a shame upon the old man if I had learned to do something he could not do.” Splendid, wasn’t it! He would not do what his father could not do. Fine! Fine as the spirit of any man with a sentiment which holds him back from leading a full, rich life. Yet can you conceive a nation of such men—idolizing what has been, blind to the great vision of the future, fettered by the chains of the past, gripped and held fast in the hand of the dead, a nation of traditionalists, unable to meet the needs of a new day, serene, no doubt self-sufficient, but coming how far short of realizing that ideal of those who praise their God for that they serve his world!

I have given the two extremes; now let us return to our point of departure, and the first question to be asked is, “What are the traditions of our people?” This nation is not as it was one hundred and thirty-odd years ago when we asserted the traditional right of Anglo-Saxons to rebel against injustice. We have traveled centuries and centuries since then—measured in events, in achievements, in depth of insight into the secrets of nature, in breadth of view, in sweep of sympathy, and in the rise of ennobling hope. Physically we are today nearer to China than we were then to Ohio. Socially, industrially, commercially the wide world is almost a unit. And those thirteen states have spread across a continent to which have been gathered the peoples of the earth. We are the “heirs of all the ages.” Our inheritance of tradition is greater than that of any other people, for we trace back not alone to King John signing the Magna Charta in that little stone hut by the river side, but to Brutus standing beside the slain Caesar, to Charles Martel with his battle axe raised against the advancing horde of an old-world civilization, to Martin Luther declaring his square-jawed policy of religious liberty, to Columbus in the prow of his boat crying to his disheartened crew, “Sail on, sail on, and on!” Irishman, Greek, Slav and Sicilian—all the nations of the world have poured their hopes and their history into this great melting pot, and the product will be—in fact, is—a civilization that is new in the sense that it is the blend of many, and yet is as old as the Egyptians.

Surely the real tradition of such a people is not any one way of doing a certain thing; certainly not any set and unalterable plan of procedure in affairs, nor even any fixed phrase expressive of a general philosophy unless it comes from the universal heart of this strange new people. Why are we here? What is our purpose? These questions will give you the tradition of the American people, our supreme tradition—the one into which all others fall, and a part of which they are—the right of man to oppose injustice. There follows from this the right of man to govern himself, the right of property and to personal liberty, the right to freedom of speech, the right to make of himself all that nature will permit, the right to be one of many in creating a national life that will realize those hopes which singly could not be achieved.

Is there any other tradition so sacred as this—so much a part of ourselves—this hatred of injustice? It carries in its bosom all the past that inspires our people, and their spirit of unrest under wrong has lighted the way for the nations of the world.

There is tradition that is of the form, and tradition that is of the substance. The West stands for the latter—not for a mere group of words or for a well-fashioned bit of governmental machinery—but for a thing that is real that has come out of our life. For the only real traditions a people have are those beliefs that have become part of them, like the good manners of a gentleman. They are really our sympathies—sympathies born of experience. Subjectively they give standpoint; objectively they furnish background—a rich, deep background like that of some master of light and shade, some Rembrandt, whose picture is one great glowing mystery of darkness save in a central spot of radiant light where stands a single figure or group who hold the eye and enchant the imagination. History may give to us the one bright face to look upon, but in the deep mystery of the background the real story is told; for therein, to those who can see, are the groping multitudes feeling their way blindly toward the light of self-expression.

One-half of the world is at war today. We look with horror upon the inhumanity of human nature and say to ourselves: "Is this all that Christianity has brought? Have we made no further progress than to make possible this reversion to the days of Attila? What has become of that sweet song of the brotherhood of man? Was it but a spiritual opiate sung to deaden the soul of a brutal world? Whither has flown that sense of outrage against injustice, that men now die by the million because a prince was killed in Serbia?"

But these are the words of an unthinking despair. Surely our memories have not failed us. We must look back, look through this blinding storm of fire and see the Europe that was, and that will be again. Then

there was to be seen a pillar of fire leading the multitude—England trying to regain her lands for her people—Germany threatened with a transfer of political power from the few to the many—Russia slowly emerging from the middle ages with her groping Douma—France, la belle France, gentle, gracious, glorious France, living out the philosophy incorporated in the first ten lines of our own Declaration of Independence.

Europe may burn up. Her people may be blasted by bankruptcy. Her national lines may be made to follow new channels. Her industries may be buried. Her sons may fall and the blood and the brain of many an unknown Tolstoi, Beethoven, Pasteur or Darwin may fertilize her shell-furrowed fields. She may set up for a day new standards of national greatness. But these, all these, cannot destroy the passionate purpose of her people to own themselves, to find themselves and to decide for themselves what chains they will bear and what sacrifices they will make. For chains and sacrifices must be; these mean social life, and only the anarchist dreams of a life without restraints. But Europe knows that it may have what we Americans long ago gained, that degree of freedom in which sacrifice is made—consciously and proudly made—for those and to those with whom we have a common interest. And this is liberty.

Now, this is a Western view of tradition; it is yours, too; it was yours first; it was your gift to us. And is it impertinent to ask, when your sensibilities are shocked at some departure from the conventional in our Western law, that you search the tradition of your own history to know in what spirit and by what method the gods of the elder days met the wrongs they wished to right? It may be that we ask too many questions; that we are unwilling to accept anything as settled; that we are curious, distrustful, and as relentlessly logical as a child.

“For what are we but creatures of the night
Led forth by day,
Who needs must falter, and with stammering steps
Spell out our paths in syllables of pain?”

There are no grown-ups in this new world of democracy. We are trying an experiment such as the world has never seen. Here we are, so many million people at work making a living as best we can; 100,000,000 people covering half a continent—rich, respected, feared. Is that all we are? Is that why we are? To be rich, respected, feared. Or have we some part to play in working out the problems of this world? Why should one man have so much and many so little? How may the many secure a larger share in the wealth which they create without de-

stroying individual initiative or blasting individual capacity and imagination? It was inevitable that these questions should be asked when this republic was established. Man has been struggling to have the right to ask these questions for 4,000 years; and now that he has the right to ask *any* questions surely we may not with reason expect him to be silent. It is no answer to make that men were not asking these questions a hundred years ago. So great has been our physical endowment that until the most recent years we have been indifferent as to the share which each received of the wealth produced. We could then accept cheerfully the coldest and most logical of economic theories. But now men are wondering as to the future. There may be much of envy and more of malice in current thought; but underneath it all there is the feeling that if a nation is to have a full life it must devise methods by which its citizens shall be insured against monopoly of opportunity. This is the meaning of many policies the full philosophy of which is not generally grasped—the regulation of railroads and other public service corporations, the conservation of natural resources, the leasing of public lands and water powers, the control of great combinations of wealth. How these movements will eventually express themselves none can foretell, but in the process there will be some who will dogmatically contend that “Whatever is, is right,” and others who will march under the red flag of revenge and expoliation. And in that day we must look for men to meet the false cry of both sides—“gentlemen unafraid” who will neither be the money-hired butlers of the rich, nor power-loving panders to the poor.

Assume the right of self-government and society becomes the scene of a heroic struggle for the realization of justice. Take from the one strong man the right to rule and make others serve, the right to take all and hold all, the power to grant or to withhold, and you have set all men to asking, “What should I have, and what should my children have?” And with this come all the perils of innovation and the hazards of revolution.

To meet such a situation the traditionalist who believes that the last word in politics or in economics was uttered a century ago is as far from the truth as he who holds that the temporary emotion of the public is the stone-carved word from Sinai.

A railroad people are not to be controlled by ox-team theories, declaims the young enthusiast for change. An age that dares to tell of what the stars are made; that weighs the very suns in its balances; that mocks the birds in their flight through the air, and the fish in their dart through the sea; that transforms the falling stream into fire, light and music; that embalms upon a piece of plate the tenderest tones of the

human voice; that treats disease with disease; that reaches into the very grave itself and starts again the silent heart—surely such an age may be allowed to think for itself somewhat upon questions of politics. The age must be allowed to think indeed! And are we of the United States all who count in this age? If we think in the foot-prints of our fathers, fearful that we may “put a shame upon the old man,” is that an end to the trouble? Is Europe not to speak because now her voice is silenced by the roar of guns? Unless I am greatly mistaken it is not from California or from Kansas or from Wisconsin that traditional forms and ideas are to receive their next great challenge, but from one or more of the nations now at war. It will in substance be a challenge that we prove ourselves as against them; not upon the field of battle, but in the field of service to a people. The world recognizes that nations may not live upon their past but must submit themselves to the pragmatic test, and we are to be put to a test of all that we have of purpose and of ingenuity to establish the superiority of our form of government as a working scheme for giving men what they want.

Those soldiers on the European battle fields are thinking this very day of what government means, of what society is organized for, of what it can do that it has not done, of what it has done that it should not do. And they will go home with a new view of the world and of their relation to it. Kipling presented us with the picture of such a man's mind in his Chant-Pagan. A retired British Tommy, a cockney, is scorning himself because of the modest duties which he is called to fulfill and the small place he now fills in the world as compared with that he held on the South African veldt.

Me that 'ave been what I've been,
 Me that 'ave gone where I've gone,
 Me that 'ave seen what I've seen—
 'Ow can I ever take on
 With awful old England again,
 An' 'ouses both sides of the street,
 And 'edges two sides of the lane,
 And the parson an' "gentry" between,
 An' touchin' my 'at when we meet—
 Me that 'ave been what I've been?

Me that 'ave followed my trade,
 In the place where the Lightnin's are made,
 'Twixt the Rains and the Sun and the Moon;
 Me that lay down an' get up
 Three years an' the sky for my roof—
 That 'ave ridden my 'unger an' thirst
 Six thousand raw mile on the hoof,
 With the Vaal and the Orange for cup,

An' the Brandwater Basin for dish,—
 Oh! it's 'ard to be'ave as they wish,
 (Too 'ard, an' a little too soon),
 I'll 'ave to think over it first—

ME!

I will arise an' get 'ence;—
 I will trek South and make sure
 If it's only my fancy or not
 That the sunshine of England is pale,
 And the breezes of England are stale,
 An' there's somethin' gone small with the lot;
 For I know of a sun an' a wind,
 An' some plains and a mountain be'ind,
 An' some graves by a barb-wire fence;
 An' a Dutchman I've fought 'oo might give
 Me a job were I ever inclined,
 To look in, and offsaddle an' live
 Where there's neither a road nor a tree—
 But only my Maker an' me,
 And I think it will kill me or cure,
 So I think I will go there an' see.

ME!

Out of the restless and awakened spirit of such men—German and Scotch and French and the others—will come surely conceptions and plans that we conservatives of America will be compelled to heed. For men are full of daring after war, and once their home fires are started again we may expect that these men who have served their governments will set about finding ways for their wider view of life to express itself in the disestablishment of the things that are useless and the upraising of things worth while. And who shall say that we should not enter on that race?

The problem of government is after all the problem of human growth, a problem of soils and sunshine, wind and weather, struggle and rejoicing, tools and vision, machinery and vitality, imagination and hope. The one constant and inconstant quantity with which man must deal is man—changing, inert, impulsive, limited, sympathetic, selfish, aspiring man. His institutions, whether social or political, must come out of his wants and out of his capacities. Luther Burbank has not yet made grapes to grow on thorns or figs on thistles. Neither has any system of government made all men wise. With our limitations such as they are we must ask not only what should be done, but what can be done. We may not follow the supreme tradition of the race to create a newer, sweeter world unless we give heed to its complementary tradition that man's experience cautions him to make a new trail with care. He must curb courage with common sense. He may lay his first bricks upon

the twentieth story, but not until he has made sure of the solidity of the frame below. The real tradition of our people permits the mason to place brick upon brick wherever he finds it most convenient, safest and most economical; but he must not mistake thin air for structural steel.

Let me illustrate the thought that I would leave with you by the description of one of our western railroads. Your train sweeps across the desert like some bold knight in a joust, and when about to recklessly drive into a sheer cliff it turns a graceful curve and follows up the wild meanderings of a stream until it reaches a ridge along which it finds its flinty way for many miles. At length you come face to face with a great gulf, a canyon—yawning, resounding and purple in its depth. Before you lies a path, zigzagging down the canyon's side to the very bottom, and away beyond another slighter trail climbs up upon the opposite side. Which is our way? Shall we follow the old trail? The answer comes as the train shoots out across a bridge and into a tunnel on the opposite side, coming out again upon the highlands and looking into the Valley of Heart's Desire where the wistful Rasselas might have lived.

When you or I look upon that stretch of steel we wonder at the daring of its builders. Great men they were who boldly built that road—great in imagination, greater in their deeds—for they were men so great that they did not build upon a line that was without tradition. The route they followed was made by the buffalo and the elk ten thousand years ago. The bear and the deer followed it generation after generation, and after them came the trapper, and then the pioneer. It was already a trail when the railroad engineer came with transit and chain seeking a path for the great black stallion of steel.

Up beside the stream and along the ridge the track was laid. But there was no thought of following the old trail downward into the canyon. Then the spirit of the new age broke through tradition, the canyon was leaped and the mountain's heart pierced, that man might have a swifter and safer way to the Valley of Heart's Desire.

The North Carolina of Tomorrow

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL ADDRESS.

BY CLARENCE POE.

That lamented son of Greensboro, Mr. Robert C. Hood, whose untimely taking-off brought to many of us a sense of personal loss, wrote on the day of his death an article which describes with rare penetration and insight the temper and capacity of our average North Carolinian. The object of this article, which proved to be his farewell message to the State he loved, was to urge that our next Governor should give his entire term of office to a Currituck-to-Cherokee crusade in behalf of rural improvement, better roads, public health, and the development of new ideals of beauty and civic pride in our cities and hamlets. Mr. Hood then used one expression to which I wish especially to direct attention. "Many of our people," he said, "are lacking in knowledge of the better way of doing things; many of them lack experience," and then added this memorable sentence: "But just about all of them are capable of doing anything they set their minds to, and it is largely a matter of getting their minds properly set."

There in two sentences, as I see it, we have an epitome of North Carolina conditions today. We have a capable people, but a people lacking as yet in aspiration and ideals, a people who have not yet been awakened to the majesty of their own possibilities and the possibilities of the State in which they live.

It is a subject in keeping with this clear-sighted patriot's analysis of conditions, namely, the need for vision in the development of the North Carolina of tomorrow, the dynamic and practical value of an ideal in commonwealth-building, that I wish to emphasize tonight. And if such a subject seem to you less practical than those to which I usually give attention, I hope before I shall have concluded, to convince you of your error.

I am the more inclined to discuss this topic because, as a reading of the statement of purposes of this organization shows, its founders sixteen years ago declared that one of its chief objects should be "the engendering of an intelligent and healthy State pride" among our people. And such a pride, I maintain, in a State so young as North Carolina—a State whose soil was but yesterday the wilderness hunting-ground of a savage race—must be based not only on what her people have achieved in the

past, but upon faith in the splendor of her future. Take any group of seventeen-year-old schoolboys, and we may have pride in their achievements, but the mainspring of such a pride is not in what they have already done, but in the tokens of character and ability assuring far worthier work in the years of their maturity. And so with a State so young that the lightwood-knots in her oldest cultivated fields have hardly yet decayed: we may rejoice in the virtues her people have proved and in the heroic deeds that have brought fame to her sons and daughters, but it is when we confidently proclaim "that which they have done but earnest of the things they yet shall do" that our eyes kindle with the keenest pride and exaltation. With us any authentic and wholesome State pride must look forward as well as backward, or perhaps I should say, must look backward only in order more confidently to look forward.

In beginning my address, therefore, I wish to lay down three principles as being fundamental to "the engendering of an intelligent and healthy State pride" such as the founders of this organization yearned to promote among our people, three principles fundamental to such a development as patriotic North Carolinians of the temper of Mr. Hood have longed for through all the patient decades of our history:

1. We must have an ideal for the North Carolina of tomorrow—an ideal exalted and ennobling.
2. We must have faith in the triumph of that ideal.
3. There must be a mobilization of all the forces in the State that look for the realization of this ideal.

I. THE NEED FOR AN IDEAL.

My first appeal tonight, my friends, my first plea to you who really love North Carolina, and who love her I trust with a passionate and eager love, my first concern is that we shall set up a worthy ideal for our people and give them a vision of how great a State, how mighty a Commonwealth, it is possible for us to build here. We must see that we have not yet aspired greatly enough. In the matters of faith and imagination, one feels that we have indeed chosen but a few herbs and apples while the immortal destinies offer us whatsoever royal gifts we will—"bread, kingdoms, stars, and sky that holds them all."

It is as true of States as of the persons who compose them, that they will achieve only in proportion to the splendor of their ideals, the earnestness with which these ideals are held, and the faith and zeal with which the ever-toilsome quest of an ideal is pursued. What President Wilson has said of the individual, "No man who does not see visions will ever realize any high hope or undertake any high enterprise," was of old declared true of nations by the inspired writer: "Where there is no vision the people perish." "Great nations," as a modern writer has said, "are built on great ideas."

Let us reflect, therefore, and ask ourselves to what extent our statesmen, orators, and teachers have held up to our people a vision of the possibilities for Commonwealth-building here in North Carolina. Who has loved the State passionately enough and has believed in her profoundly enough to proclaim that we, "the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time"—that we may well achieve in the providence of God, a civilization as rich, as varied, as fruitful of sublime influences on all after-ages, as any that men in any other land or era have wrought out—England, Scotland, France, Germany, Greece, or Rome?

"The great use of a friend," says Emerson, "is to make us do what we can"; and today the great use of friends and lovers of North Carolina is to make her do what she can—to open the eyes of her people to their possibilities and engender in them a faith in their capacity to make these possibilities actualities. As surely as "the ancestor of every action is a thought," so surely is the ancestor of every great achievement a great ideal. Not without reason has it been said, "Let me write the songs of a nation and I care not who makes its laws," because however unworthy the laws of today may be, let but the seed of dynamic aspiration find lodgment in a people's heart and that aspiration will tomorrow body itself forth irresistibly in statutes and customs. Mr. George W. Russell, the Irish poet-philosopher, in a stimulating article on "The Antecedents of Civilization," has declared that "a civilization is the externalization of the soul and character of a people," and it is great and majestic according to the treasure of beauty, imagination, will and thought, laid up in the soul of the country. On all nations and all individuals, he continues, "is laid the necessity to make their external life correspond in some measure to their interior life"; so that a man of artistic soul will never be content to live in an ugly house, an intellectual man in a disordered society, or a man of high moral character in an environment in conflict with his inner ideals. Nor can I refrain from quoting here and substituting our word North Carolina for his word Irish, a further paragraph so applicable to our own conditions:

We must go on imagining better than the best we know. Even in their ruins now, Greece and Italy seem noble and beautiful with broken pillars and temples made in the day of their glory. But before there was ever a white marble temple shining on a hill it shone with a more brilliant beauty in the mind of some artist who designed it. Do many people know how that marvelous Greek civilization spread along the shores of the Mediterranean? Little nations owning no more land than would make up a North Carolina county sent out colony after colony. The seed of beautiful life they sowed grew and blossomed out into great cities and half-divine civilizations. Italy had a later blossoming of beauty in the Middle Ages, and travelers today go into little Italian towns and find them filled with masterpieces of painting

and architecture and sculpture, witnesses of a time when nations no larger than a North Carolina county rolled their thoughts up to heaven and mixed their imagination with the angels.

One resplendent ideal we must at least set up; on one far-off divine event we must at least fix our gaze as the end of all our striving—remembering that though—

The goal may ever shine afar,
The will to win it makes us free—

and that sublime purpose, constant as the North Star in our heavens, must be to build here in North Carolina a civilization passionate with aspiration for all the noblest qualities that have found expression in the worthiest civilizations of the past—the beauty that was Greece, the majesty of the law made incarnate in Rome, the reverence and spiritual earnestness which distinguished the Hebrew people, the passion for liberty and democracy which has characterized our English ancestors and kinsfolk, the triumph of scientific efficiency of which Germany now furnishes an unforgettable demonstration.

This, then, is my appeal and summons to you, my fellow-workers for the greater North Carolina of tomorrow—to you who make her literature, whether as writers of books or as those unrecognized makers of literature who send out her dailies and weeklies from a hundred towns and hamlets; to you men of research who interpret the lessons of her history; to you teachers who have the instruction of her youth; to you men of the professions and of public station, who have the ear of her men and women—my appeal to you one and all is that you fail not to bring the vision of her potentialities before the sons and daughters of the State. In the language of that distinguished son of North Carolina who now represents this Nation at the Court of St. James, I would have us “look forward to a golden age that we may surely hasten, not backward to one that never was.” I would have us believe with Shelley, that “the world’s great age begins anew,” that here and now a loftier Argo shall cleave the main, a brighter Hellas rear its mountains, while—

Another Athens shall arise,
And to remoter time
Bequeath like sunset to the skies
The splendor of its prime.

II. FAITH IN NORTH CAROLINA’S ABILITY TO ACHIEVE OUR IDEAL.

Only one thing, my friends, can hinder North Carolina on its march to such an imperial destiny, and that is the fault for which the Master of Life oftenest reproached men when He was on earth. That fault was lack of faith in God and lack of faith in themselves as heirs to an

Almighty Father's majesty and power; spiritual inertia. How tremendous and significant was His rebuke, "Had ye but faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye could remove mountains." We need some man to electrify North Carolina with that sublime confidence with which Kant incited Germany to high endeavor, and epitomized in the famous sentence, "Thou canst, for thou shalt." We need seers to look forward to North Carolina's future as Milton peered into England's future in the famous lines beginning: "Methinks that I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep and shaking her invincible locks. Methinks I see her as an eagle mewing her mighty youth and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam."

In this spirit, for myself, I proclaim my North Carolina "Credo," and the reasons for the faith that is in me:

I believe in North Carolina, in her coming awakening, in the glory of her destiny; I believe that whatever of good or beauty or nobleness men in any other land or era have wrought, we, men and women, of North Carolina today and tomorrow, in the providence of God, may here and now achieve.

1. I believe this, first, because the history of other countries gives warrant for this high faith. In the language of another: "We have all that any people ever had to inspire them—the heavens above us, the generous earth beneath, and the breath of life in our nostrils." And though man, by taking thought cannot add a cubit to his physical stature, mere will has added incalculably to man's mental or moral stature, and civilizations have been built by the mere will to build them. Every one realizes that it was a group of enthusiastic leaders firing and moulding the national conscience and consciousness, who created modern Germany. "The national being," as has been said, "was enriched by a long succession of mighty thinkers. A great subjective life preceded a great objective manifestation of power and wealth." "To release from inertia and set in motion *moral power*"—that, says Kuno Francke of Harvard, was the purpose of the Stein-Hardenberg legislation; and he quotes Frederick William III., himself, as describing it as the effort of the State "to replace, by spiritual agencies, what it had lost in physical resources." However much we may differ as to the nobleness of the ideal, we may not doubt that it was by patient and never-ceasing insistence upon such an ideal that the German nation has been made what it is. And so today the visions of George W. Russell and Sir Horace Plunkett are slowly remaking Ireland, just as surely as the visions of Grundtvig remade Denmark, and the faith of Mazzini, Cavour, and Garibaldi made modern Italy. And if it be asserted, as

I heard a man of national reputation recently remark in casual conversation, that North Carolina has been a commonplace State," if it be true that the State has not shone above her sisters in "the sudden making of splendid names," I answer again in the words of our Irish poet-philosopher :

The most famous peoples have been obscure for centuries and without fame as our own people are, until somehow the keynote was struck which made them vibrate to one idea. For how many centuries were there herdsmen and rude rustics in ancient Greece before the dream came to animate the people? Out of what barbaric beginnings through unilluminated centuries came the magnificence of ancient Rome? If one little chemical is not added to the compound in the shell, it may be fired out of the cannon, but the shell will not burst. We want a national ideal mixed with our energies to set Ireland in a blaze.

2. In the second place, let me remind you that here in North Carolina we have not merely the advantages that all other men have in common with us, but we possess in unusual degree the physical and material basis for the building of a noble and opulent civilization. In point of total area North Carolina is greater than Greece or Scotland, with all their mighty contributions to history; greater than the combined kingdoms of Holland, Belgium and Denmark; greater even than imperial England itself with its thirty-four million souls, its earth-girdling realm and far-flung battle line. In agriculture, our resources are astounding; in manufactures our Piedmont country has advantages almost unrivaled; and while we lack mineral wealth, our almost matchless water-powers will be performing the herculean labors of an electric age long after the coal deposits of other States have been exhausted. Moreover, as official records show, Raleigh, Edenton, Charlotte, and Chapel Hill have the exact mean annual temperature of Rome; Greensboro and Weldon that of Florence; Wilmington is a degree cooler than Athens or Jerusalem, while Asheville's climate is practically that of London and Paris. Hence we have the same climate, we breathe the very airs, we are stimulated by the same tempered mingling of wind and storm and sun, in which men have not only wrought mightily in modern times, but in which in ancient days men in Greece and Rome and Palestine wrought out those civilizations which yet project themselves with imperial and compelling power into the lives of every Commonwealth and individual in Christendom—their poets, prophets and statesmen "the dead but sceptered sovereigns who still rule us from their urns." There can be no doubt about it, that with such resources in such an environment—aided by that scientific husbandry and aggressive industrialism which has already superseded the primitive ways of our pioneer days—we shall have wealth in plenty to support a culture of

the highest type. Thomas Gray, two centuries ago, pointed out the two things which had hindered England's development—first, illiteracy, in that Knowledge, rich with the spoils of time, had never been made accessible to her plain people; second, poverty, in that—

Chill penury repressed their noble rage
And froze the genial current of the soul.

North Carolina is now escaping not only from the first of these handicaps, but from the second also. Nor should I fail to add that, by reason of our growing wealth, made possible by our vast resources, the need for growth in ideals is all the more insistent and imperative. In wealth lies at once our power and our peril, in that wealth, like food, when taken beyond the power of wholesome assimilation, becomes a source, not of health and power, but of disease and disaster. Without a capable and progressive people, therefore, increasing wealth might mean only an exchange of the wholesome virtues of industrious poverty for the decadent manners of the uncultured rich—the “pride, fullness of bread and abundance of idleness,” which the Almighty of old denounced as the iniquity of Sodom.

3. My next reason for faith in the North Carolina of tomorrow, however, is the belief that we have a people who exemplifying the significant motto of the Commonwealth—“*Esse quam videri*,” “To be rather than to seem”—will be misled into no extravagance of show and appearance, into no temptation to slothful ease. We have a capable people of the same stock as those who have built great civilizations in the past, and yet unspoiled: courageous as they have ever been, “tender and open,” as they were in the colonial days described by Bancroft, “disciplined in frugality and patient of toil.” There are those who say the record of these people has been marked by extreme conservatism, by a slowness of movement which will prevent them from acquiring the best in modern government and society, but I do not so read their history. They have not been rash, but in all matters affecting human rights and human progress they have ever been progressive rather than backward. North Carolina was certainly not conservative in colonial days, when her demands for liberty and progressive legislation made the life of every British Governor a sort of continuous nightmare. She was not conservative in the days of the Regulators, the stamp tax, and the tea tax. She was not laggard of heart or hand in the days of the Mecklenburg and Halifax Resolves. She was, as Governor Baldwin of Connecticut has recently pointed out, the first State to put into her Constitution a provision for public education, the first to provide for the secret ballot, and the first to abandon annual for biennial elections. And while her people were slow to adopt the Constitution of the United

States, it was because they were so modern in their conceptions of democracy that they delayed entering the Union until persuaded that it would properly safeguard fundamental human rights. Says Governor Baldwin: "They endeavored to make, and did make, the new government more closely a government of the people, before accepting its authority." Then for fifty years prior to the Civil War, North Carolina's record in public education, internal improvements, the extension of suffrage, etc., marked it as perhaps the most progressive of all the States laboring under the handicap of slavery. And while she did not rush into secession it was because her people were unwilling rashly to jeopardize human rights and constitutional liberty in order to defend the property rights of her slave-holding class.

Moreover, the record of the State since the Civil War, had I time to enter into details—our patient rebuilding from the debris of war and reconstruction, our progress since that time in education, temperance, agricultural and industrial development, to say nothing of political upheavals daring to the point of radicalism in their willingness to risk change—would prove equally fatal to the contentions of those who would believe us too slow-moving to grasp opportunity or adapt ourselves to changing circumstance. The stagnation that has marked certain periods of our history, if I judge aright, has been due to the handicap of illiteracy rather than to inertia. In other words, I feel that the people in those periods failed to use their powers, not from willful slothfulness, but simply because those powers had not been set free by the liberating influences of education.

4. And this brings me to a consideration of one other historic trait of our North Carolina people which I regard as of the highest significance and highest promise. This is the fact that while the State has given the Nation and the world not one of "the few, the immortal, names that were not born to die," while she has produced no Washington or Jefferson or Lee or Calhoun, yet her plain man, her average citizen, the great masses of her people, have made a record which may indeed give us pride in her past and confidence in her future. In colonial days she had no individual Patrick Henry or Benjamin Franklin or Samuel Adams, but the plain, sturdy, homespun-clad people of Cape Fear. Mecklenburg, Alamance, Guilford, Halifax, and Kings Mountain, while lacking celebrated leadership, yet gave an account of themselves which better guarantees our future than the achievement of any possible half-dozen individuals could have done. And again, it is our proud boast, that when civil war came the record of the State was distinguished, not for a few great leaders, but for the courage and enduring heroism of that host of plain North Carolina privates, who, going "with

songs to battle, straight of limb, true of eye, steady and aglow," furnished more men in killed and wounded than any other Southern State. It is not without significance that the only monument in Capitol Square erected in recognition of services in the Civil War (Vance's is there by reason of his services as statesman rather than as warrior), is in honor of a private soldier.

5. And here we find another, and probably the strongest of all, reasons for faith in the North Carolina of tomorrow: that not only has our common man achieved notably, but that our government and people have always had faith in the common man; have had an unquenchably democratic spirit. North Carolina before the Civil War was notably more democratic than our neighbor States—a fact emphasized by its leadership in public education, under Calvin H. Wiley, at a time when other Southern States were indifferent and a Governor of South Carolina was even urging the Legislature to make appropriations for the University at the expense of the common schools, declaring that "one sun is better than a million stars." We have had among us less of the spirit which divides men of the same race and blood into classes; we have had less of the spirit which in some sections has made the wealthier five per cent of the population, the men and women upon whom were imposed the sacred duties of privilege and leadership, draw about themselves the robes of a Pharisaical and supercilious self-satisfaction while they damned the other ninety-five per cent as hopeless "poor whites"—until from that contemned class itself, emigrant to the West, the Union drew its supreme leader and the flower of the army that crushed the army in which my father fought. It is the glory of North Carolina that she has recognized in increasing measure the fact that the most authentic and accurate index to the power and possibilities of every boy and girl is found, not in the achievements or non-achievements of two or three immediate ancestors, but is found rather in his or her racial heritage—that there beats with the blood of every child born of our race the spirit of the long, long centuries of toil and struggle, achievement, discipline, moral restraint and spiritual aspiration which make up the body of Caucasian civilization, so that in a very real sense all men and women of the same race, inheritors of the same racial history, traits and tendencies, are indeed "created equal." However dormant or repressed may have been the ability of the father, North Carolina looks with confidence to every child through whose veins courses the blood of the race that has produced heroes and martyrs and poets and sages, men of vision and daring and achievement, builders of civilization and of empire, and her people realize that no one knows when or where or in

whom the genius of that race may again "burst full-blossomed on the thorny stem of time."

For my own part, my friends, I am persuaded that with a stock so sturdy and capable, and with natural and social conditions so auspicious, such an ultimate flowering of the genius of our people is inevitable; that not only shall we develop a civilization whose average level will be high, but that even as one generation in Virginia produced a Washington, a Jefferson, a Marshall, a Madison, a Henry, and a Monroe, so there will arise from some generation of our own people a group of North Carolinians who will as greatly and yet more variously enrich the annals of our race.

III. THE MOBILIZATION OF ALL THE FORCES INTENT UPON THE IDEAL.

The one other thing that remains for me to say is that if we are to achieve our high ambition, there must be a mobilization of all the forces that make for progress in North Carolina—finding spokesmen in all who write and teach and speak and preach, and best of all, in those who organize the people into anything that unites them in quest of common aims, whether women's clubs, farmers' clubs, chambers of commerce, corn and canning clubs, civic leagues, or what not. Our writers and editors must become as men inspired with a new faith and a new vision; our schools must become indeed "centers of idealism," dynamos of patriotism and culture such as the revolution-working schools of Denmark have been; our churches must awaken to the Heaven-imposed duty not only of transforming the souls of men, but of making that transformation manifest here in the establishment of that Kingdom for whose coming we are taught ever to pray. We must inspire even the humblest worker with a faith in the future of his State; the humblest boy in patched trousers, the humblest girl in her gingham dress, must be caught up in the sweep of our master-purpose and made to feel that he or she has a part in its realization.

We must learn this lesson from war—that what glorifies it and relieves the hideousness of it is the fact that then the life of the commonest man is identified with that of the State, every humblest soldier feels that he is keeping step to the drum-beat of the progress of his race; and we must redeem our governments from their traditional commonplaceness in time of peace, in that they have not inspirited this common man, that they have not caught him up in the surge of human progress, that they have been content to narrow their functions to the protection of property and the preservation of peace and have not organized the tremendous energies of the Commonwealth for the achievement of great ideals! This is really our supreme task—to evoke in time of peace

that ardent love for the State, and for each county or community in which we dwell, which flames out so gloriously in the lowliest man in time of war. With such a spirit the North Carolina of our tomorrow, house by house, town by town, neighborhood by neighborhood, will clothe itself with myriad forms of intellectual and material beauty that will keep time with the blossoming of noble ideals in the minds of individual men and women.

You probably recall what was said of Henry W. Grady when he died, that he was "literally loving a nation into peace," and so our need in North Carolina, and in each town or county, is a man great enough of heart and soul to love it into new ideals of beauty, faith, and noble endeavor. It might be well said of each individual town and of each individual county in which you live, my friends, as Gilbert Chesterton said recently of his little English town of Pimlico:

It is not enough for a man to disapprove of Pimlico; in that case he will merely cut his throat or move to Chelsea. Nor certainly is it enough for a man to approve of Pimlico; for then it will remain Pimlico, which would be awful. The only way out of it seems to be for somebody to love Pimlico—to love it with a transcendental power. If there arose a man who loved Pimlico, then Pimlico would rise into ivory towers and golden pinnacles. If men loved Pimlico as mothers love children, arbitrarily, because it is theirs, Pimlico in a year or two might be fairer than Florence.

And then Mr. Chesterton concludes with one memorable and meaningful sentence: "Men did not love Rome because she was great. She was great because they had loved her."

Even so men will not love the North Carolina of tomorrow because she is great. She will be great because her sons and daughters love and have loved her—and loving her give their lives to her enrichment through aid to all the inspiring movements of our teeming time and the betterment of the neighborhoods they dwell in.

In that glad day when such a spirit shall have been indeed engendered among all our people, you and I will no longer go about our unhalloved daily tasks without exaltation and without a sense of the nobleness and dignity of our existence and our labors. Rather, while we do the humblest work that shall make our community better and so make North Carolina better, while we cleave the prosaic stone or mix the unlovely mortar in the common round, we shall see with our mind's eye the glorious form and structure of the State that is to be, majestic as the columns of ancient Parthenon, beautiful as far-famed Taj Mahal with its matchless symmetry—the Commonwealth which the genius of our North Carolina people, under the guidance of God, shall yet evolve as the half-divine sum total of our individual labors.

Can Democracy Be Organized?

BY EDWIN A. ALDERMAN.

The United States of America is one of the oldest governments on earth. England and Russia alone, among the nations of Europe, equal it in age, and even England has undergone such radical changes in the past century, as compared with the United States, as to constitute us, with our unchanged government since 1789, the most stable of modern nations. Our nearness to the perspective and our absorption in our own life have blinded us to the inspiring national panorama, as it has unfolded itself before the world. First, a group of rustic communities, making common cause in behalf of ancient guarantees of English freedom; then suspicious colonies, unused to the ways of democracies, striving after some bond amid the clash of jealous interests; then a wonderful paper-writing, compact of high sense and human foresight and tragic compromise; then a young Republic, lacking the instinct of unity, but virile, unlovely, raw, wayward, in its confident young strength. Some confused decades of sad, earnest effort to pluck out an evil growth planted in its life by the hard necessities of compromise by the fathers, but which needs must blossom into the flower of civil war before it could be plucked out and thrown to the void. Then young manhood, nursing its youth, whole and undivisible, proven by trial of fire and dark days, opening its eye upon a new world of steam and force, and seizing greedily and selfishly every coin of vantage; and today the most venerable Republic, the richest of nations, the champion and exemplar of World Democracy.

No nation, I venture to assert, was ever born grounded on so definite and fixed principle and with so conscious a purpose. Such a wealth of hope for humanity never before gathered about a mere political experiment, and such a mass of pure idealism never before suffused itself into the frame-work of a State. How can such a nation so begun, so advanced, so beset, be so guided, that all of its citizens shall indeed become free men, entering continually into the possession of intellectual, material and moral benefits? How can a people devoted to individualism and freedom retain that individualism which guarantees freedom and yet engraft upon their social order that genius for coöperation which alone insures power and progress? These are the final interrogatories of democracy as a sane vision glimpses it, robbed of its earlier illusions. The fathers of this Republic did not understand the present mould of democracy. The very word was obnoxious to them. Their ideal was

a State, the citizens of which chose their leaders and then trusted them. They did not foresee the socialized State. They did not envisage a minute and paternal organization of society which may be achieved alike by Prussian absolutism or mere socialism, which is chronologically, if not logically, the child of democracy. The fear that tugged at their hearts was the fear of tyranny, the dread of Kings, the denial of self-direction, which prevented a man from speaking his opinion or going his way as he willed. Their democracy was a working government which should give effect to the will of the people and at the same time provide sufficient safeguard for individual liberty. The emphasis of the time was everywhere upon the rights of the individual, rather more than upon the duties of the citizen. When their theories, as Mr. Hadley points out, seemed likely to secure this result, the fathers published them boldly; when they seemed likely to interfere, they ignored them. The creed, then which had a religious sanction in an age of moral imagination to men of superb human enthusiasm like Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and Adams, was the belief that democracy, considered as individual freedom, was the final form of human society. It is idle to deny that a century of trial has somewhat dulled the halo about this ancient concept of democracy, but in my judgment only to men of little faith. It is quite true that our democracy of today is not what Rousseau thought it would be, nor Lord Byron, nor Shelley, nor Karl Marx. But as we meditate about it and conclude that it has not realized all of its hopes, we ought to try to settle first what it has done and then place that to its credit. Here are some things that I think democracy has done, or helped to do. It has abated sectarian fury. Sectarian fury is ridiculous in this age; it was not always so. It has abolished slavery. It has protected and enlarged manhood suffrage and has gone far towards womanhood suffrage. It has mitigated much social injustice. It has developed a touching and almost sublime faith in the power of education, illustrating it by expending six hundred million dollars a year in the most daring thing that democracy has ever tried to do; namely, to fit for citizenship every human being born within its borders. It has increased kindness and gentleness, and thus diminished the fury of partisanship. It has preserved the form of the Union through the storm of a civil war, and yet has had power to touch with healing unity and forgiveness its passions and tragedies. It has conquered and civilized a vast continent. It has developed great agencies of culture and has somehow made itself a symbol of individual prosperity. It has developed a common consciousness and a volunteer statesmanship among its free citizens as manifested more strikingly than elsewhere in the world in great educational, religious, scientific

and philanthropic societies, which profoundly influence and mould society. Out of what other state could have issued as a volunteer movement so efficient an agency as the Commission for the Relief of Belgium or the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission? It has permitted and fostered the growth of a public press of gigantic power reflecting the crudities and impulses of a vast and varied population, but charged with a fierce idealism and staunch patriotism that have almost given it a place among the coördinate branches of our organized government. It has stimulated inventive genius and business enterprise to a point never before reached in human annals. It has brought to American-mindedness millions of men of all races, creeds and ideals. I do not, therefore, think that democracy as it has evolved among us has failed. What autocracy on earth has done as much? It has justified itself of the sufferings and sacrifices and the dreams of the men who established it in this new land. But it has also, without doubt, by the very trust that it places in men, developed new shapes of temptations and wrong-doing. Democracy, like a man's character, is never clear out of danger. The moral life of men, said Froude, is like the flight of a bird in the air; he is sustained only by effort, and when he ceases to exert himself he falls. And the same, it seems to me, is impressively true of institutional and governmental life.

Patriotism—which is hard to define and new with every age, and public spirit, which is hard to define and new with every age—must constantly redefine themselves. Patriotism meant manhood's rights when Washington took it to his heart. It somehow spelled culture, refinement and distinction of mind when Emerson in his Phi Beta Kappa address besought the sluggish intellect of his country to look up from under its iron lids. It signified national ideals and theories of government to the soldiers of Lee and to the soldiers of Grant. It meant industrial greatness and a splendid desire to annex nature to man's uses when the great business leaders of this generation and of the last generation built up their great businesses and tied the Union together in a unity of steel and steam more completely than all the wars could do, and did it with a patriotism and a statesmanship and an imagination that no man can deny. The honest business man needs somebody to praise him. He has done a great service in this country, and when he is steady and honest there is no greater force in all our life. A decade ago patriotism in America meant a reaction from an unsocial, unselfish individualism to restraint and consideration for the general welfare, expressing itself in a cry for moderation and fairness and justice and sympathy in the use of power and wealth as the states of spirit and mind, that alone can safeguard republican ideals. The emphasis, as I have said, was

formerly on the rights of man; it is getting to be placed, as Mazzini preached, upon the duties of man. If in our youth and feverish strength there had grown up a spirit of avarice and a desire for quick wealth, and a theory of life in lesser minds that estimated money as everything and was willing to do anything for money, that very fact served to define the patriotic duty and mood of the national mind. This reawakened patriotism of the common good had the advantage of appeal to a sound, public conscience, and of being supported by a valid public opinion. The part that vulgar cunning has played in creating great fortunes has been made known to this democracy and they are coming to know the genuine from the spurious, and some who were once looked at with admiration and approval as great ones, are not now seen in that light.

This very growth in discernment gave us power to see in a nobler and truer light, for the people of America, the names of those upright souls in business and in politics—and there are many noble men in business and politics—who have held true in a heady time and who have kept clean and kept human their public sympathies and their republican ideals and by so doing have kept sweet their country's fame. Democracy simply had met and outfaced one of the million moral crises that are likely to assail free government, and I believe that it is cleaner to-day in ruling passion, in motive, and in practice than it has been in fifty years.

It is now clear to all minds that the movement of our business operations in this Republic, unregulated and proceeding along individualistic lines, had come perilously near to developing a scheme of monopoly and a union of our political machinery with the forces of private gain that might easily have transformed our democracy into some ugly form of tyranny and injustice. We have halted this tendency somewhat tardily, but resolutely, and the nerves of the nation were somewhat shaken by the very thought of what might have been, very much as a man gazes with gratitude and yet with fear upon a hidden precipice over which his pathway led. We had been saying over and over to ourselves with fierce determination that this nation should remain democratic, and should not become plutocratic or autocratic or socialistic; and we should find the way to guarantee this. All about us were heard the voices of those who thought they saw the way and who were beckoning men to follow, but new dangers faced us, however, even as we left the ancient highway and attempted to cut new paths, for in endeavoring to make it possible for democracy, as we understood it, and a vast industrialism, as we had developed it, to live together justly under the same political roof, we had plainly come to a point where there was danger of our gov-

ernment developing into a system of state socialism in conflict with our deepest traditions and convictions. The leadership of the future, therefore, would have a triple problem—to protect the people against privilege, to raise the levels of democratic living, and to preserve for the people the ancient guarantees and inestimable advantages of representative government and individual initiative.

You will observe that I have thus far spoken as a citizen preoccupied with the thoughts of that ancient world which ended on August 1, 1914, and I had not permitted myself to align and examine in full the perils and weaknesses of democratic society as they had manifested themselves under conditions of peace and apparent prosperity. These weaknesses had already begun under the strain of ordinary industrial life, to reveal themselves under five general aspects, each aspect being in essence a sort of revulsion or excess of feeling from what were considered definite political virtues.

1. A contempt of obedience as a virtue too closely allied to servility.
2. A disregard of discipline as smacking too much of docility.
3. An impatience with trained technical skill as seeming to affirm that one man is not as good as another.
4. A failure to understand the value of the common man as a moral and political asset and an inability to coördinate education to daily life as a means of forwarding national ends and ideals.
5. A crass individualism which exalted self and its rights above society and the solemn social obligation to coöperate for the common good.

The theory of democracy which alone among great human movements had known no setback for a century of time, was fast becoming self-critical and disposed to self-analysis and especially in America, these fundamental weaknesses were being assailed in practical forms. The liberal or progressive movement in our politics was striking at the theory of crass individualism and after the unbalanced fashion of social reform was moving toward pure democracy or state socialism in the interest of communal welfare. Our old original, intense American individualism, shamed by its ill-governed cities and lack of concern for popular welfare, had passed forever. Socialism, considered as a paternal form of government, exercising strict regulation over men's lives and destroying individual energy and initiative, was still feared and resisted; but the social goal of democracy was becoming, even by the most conservative, to be considered the advancement and improvement of society by a protection of life and health, by a reformation of educational methods and by a large amount of governmental control of fundamentals for the com-

mon good. A multitude of laws, ranging from laws governing milk for babies, to public parks and free dispensaries and vast corporations attested the vigor of this new attitude. And strange to say this new spirit was not wholly self-begotten. Plutocracy, with its common sense, its economies and hatred of waste, its organization and its energy, had taught us much. We, too, had caught a spirit from what we used to call effete Europe. Australia taught us how to vote; Belgium, Germany and England that there was a democracy adapted to city and factory as well as to the farm and country-side.

The forces of education were pleading the cause of team work in modern life, scientifically directed, not by amateurs and demagogues, but by experts and scientists, whether in city government or public hygiene or scientific land culture, while seriousness and self-restraint were everywhere the themes of public teachers, pleading for order and organization as an ideal of public welfare, nearly as vital as liberty and self-direction. And then, without warning, fell out this great upheaval of the world, so vast, so fundamental, despite its sordid and stupid beginnings, that the dullest among us must dimly realize that a new epoch has registered itself in human affairs. War is a great pitiless flame. It sweeps its fiery torch along the ways of men, destroying but renovating, killing but quickening, and even amid its horrors of corruption and death, leaving white ashes cleanly and fertile. War is also a ghastly mirror in which actualities and ideals and tendencies reflect themselves in awful vividness. Who caused this war, who will be aggrandized by this war—its triumphs and humiliations—are important and moving, but not vital questions. The fundamental question is what effect will its reactions have upon that movement of the human spirit called democracy, begun so simply, advanced so steadfastly, yesterday acclaimed as the highest development of human polity, but today already being sneered at and snarled at by a host of enemies. Will war, the harshest of human facts, destroy, weaken, modify, or strengthen essential democracy? It is my conviction that the Allies in this struggle are fighting for democracy—at least for the brand of democracy with which my spirit is familiar and which my soul has learned to love. Once more in the great human story, the choice is being made between contrasting civilizations, between ideals and institutions, between liberty and the lesser life. Every drop of my blood leaps to sympathy with those peoples who, heedless of inexorable efficiency dream a mightier dream of an order directed by justice, invigorated by freedom, instinct with the higher happiness of individual liberty, self-directed to reason and coöperation. “For what avail the plough or sail, or land or life if freedom fail?” The very weaknesses of democratic government under the

crucial test of war appeal to me. The tutelage of democracy breeds love of justice, the methods of persuasion and debate, and a conception of life which makes it sweet to live and in a way destroys the temperament for war, until horror and wrong and reversion to type create anew the savage impulse. Whatever way victory falls, democracy is destined to stand its trial, and to be submitted to a merciless cross-examination by the mind and spirit of man. It may and will yield up some of its aspirations; it will seize and adapt some of the weapons of its foes; it may relinquish some of its ancient theories and methods; it will shed some of its hampering weaknesses; but it will still remain democracy, and it is the King, the autocrat, and the mechanical state which will suffer in the end rather than the common man who, in sublime loyalty to race and flag, is now reddening the soil of Europe with his blood, or the great principle which has fascinated every generous thinking soul since freedom became the heritage of man.

The Germans are a mighty race, fecund in physical force and organizing genius. Like the French of 1789, they are now more possessed with a group of passionate creative impulses than any other nation. This grandiose idealism, for such it is, seems to me reactionary, but it is held with a sort of thrilling devotion and executed with undoubted genius. Nineteen hundred and fourteen is for the Prussians a sort of Prussian Elizabethan age, in which vast dreams and ideas glow in the hearts and minds of Teutonic Raleighs, Drakes, and Grenvilles, ready to die for them. The ideal of organization, the thought of a great whole uniting its members for effective work in building a powerful state, and the welding of a monstrous federal union of nations akin in interests and civilizations possess the Germanic mind. For the German the individual exists for the state, and his concept of the state is far more beautiful and spiritual than we Americans generally imagine. The state is to be the resultant of the best thought and efforts of all its units. They have a glorious concept of communal welfare, but to them parliamentarism is frankly a disease and suffrage a menace. To them, and I am quoting a notable German scholar, "democracy is a thing, infirm of purpose, jealous, timid, changeable, unthorough, without foresight, blundering along in an age of lucidity guided by confused instincts." On the whole Germany is probably better governed in external forms than the United States or England. The material conditions of her people are better, her cities cleaner, her economies finer, her social life better administered and her power to achieve amazing results under the fiercest of tests nearly marvelous. The world cannot and probably will not reject as vile all this German scholarship concentration and scientific power. The world may either slavishly imitate Germany, or wisely modify or set

up a contrary system overtopping the German ideal in definite accomplishment, according to the inclination of the scales of victory. The fatality of the German nation is that it does not behold the world as it is. It beholds its ideals and is logic-driven to their achievement. It has gone from the sand wastes of Brandenburg to world power by force and the will to do, and by force and will it seeks its will and hacks its way through. It is enslaved by the majesty of plan and precision—the power of concert. Napoleon, “that ablest of historic men,” as Lord Acton called him, tried all this once and failed. But here it all is again, with its weapons of flame and force. Germany, apparently, does not understand the fair doctrine of live and let live. Pride sustains its soul, and ambition directs its energy. In spite of all these concrete achievements Germany does not seem to me a progressive nation, but rather a Giant of Reaction—a sort of mixture, as some one has called it, of Ancient Sparta and Modern Science. And it is well to hold in mind that this mass-efficiency is brought to pass by subjecting even in the minutest particulars the individual to the supreme authority of the state. This subjection is scientific, well-meant, but very minute.

The flaw of democracy is that it does understand and sympathize with the soul of man, but is so sympathetic with his yearning for free self-government and self-direction, so opposed to force, as a moulding agent, so jealous of initiative, that it has not yet found the binding thread of social organization by which self-government and good government become one and the same thing. Let us confess that “*Les mœurs de la liberté!*” cannot be the manners of absolutism. Debate, political agitation, bold, popular expression, are not the methods of smooth precision and relentless order. Napoleon revealed to the world the democratic passion and passed off the stage. Perhaps it is the destiny of the Prussian to teach us administration and order and to put us in the way of finding and achieving it without sacrificing our liberties, and then he, too, will pass.

To work out a free democratic, socialized life, wherein the individual is not lost in a metaphysical super-state, nor sunk in inaction and selfishness, by inducing desire for such life, by applying trained intelligence to its achievement, and by subjecting ourselves to the tests and disciplines that will bring it to pass. That is the task of American Democracy and indeed of a fuller, deeper world-wide democracy. The center of gravity of the autocratic state is in the State itself, and in such ideals as self-anointed leaders suggest. The effect of the democracy has been to shift the center of gravity too much to the individual self and his immediate welfare.

There must be a golden mean somewhere and we must find it. When the great readjustment dawns, when the gaping wounds of war have healed, all the world will be seeking this golden mean. The social democrat of Germany, who is silent now in his splendid national devotion, will be seeking it; the Russian peasant, inarticulate, mystic, reflective; the Frenchman with his clear brain and forward-looking soul; the Englishman wrapped in his great tradition. Perhaps in our untouched and undreamed vigor, we shall become the champions of the great quest.

There would be fitness in such a result. Here continental democracy was born; here it has grown great upon an incomparable soil and with enormous waste. Let us prepare for our colossal moral and practical responsibilities in the world life, therefore, not alone by preparing common sense establishments of force on land and sea, until such time as human reason shall deem them not needed, but by the greater preparedness of self-restraint, self-analysis, and self-discipline. Let us not surrender our age-long dream of good, just self-government to any mechanical ideal of quickly obtaining material results erected into a crude dogma of efficiency. Democracy must know how to get material results economically and quickly. Democracy must and can be organized to that end, and this organization will undoubtedly involve certain surrenders, certain social and political self-abnegations in the interests of collectivism. But I hold the faith that all this can be done yet, retaining in the family of freedom that shining jewel of individual liberty which has glowed in our life since the beginning. The great democratic nations—America, England, France, Switzerland—have before them, therefore, the problem of retaining their standards of individual liberty, and yet contriving juster and finer administrative organs. Certainly the people that have built this Union can learn how to coördinate the activities of its people and obtain results as definite as those obtained under systems of mere authority.

Since my college days I have been hearing about and admiring the German genius for research, for adaptation of scientific truth and for organization. Now the whole world stands half astonished and half envious of their creed of efficiency. In so far as this creed is opposed to slipshodness and waste, it is altogether good, but the question arises, is the ability to get things done well deadly to liberty, or is it consistent with personal liberty? In examining German progress, I do not find as many examples of supreme individual efficiency or independent spirit as I find in the democratic nations. The steam engine, the factory system, telegraph, telephone, wireless, electric light, the gasoline engine, aeroplane, machine gun, the submarine, uses of rubber, dreadnaught, the mighty names of Lister and Pasteur, come out of the democratic

nations. The distinctive German genius is for administration and adaptation, rather than for independent creation. His civil service is the finest in the world. He knows what he wants. He decides what training is necessary to get that result. He universalizes that training. He enforces obedience to its discipline. A man must have skill; he must obey; he must work; he must coöperate. The freer nations desire the same results, but neglect to enforce their realization. Their theory of government forces them to plead for its attainment. Certain classes and individuals heed this persuasion, and in an atmosphere of precious freedom great personalities spring into being. In the conflict between achievement based on subjection and splendid obedience, and that based on political freedom, my belief is that the system of political and social freedom will triumphantly endure. In essence, it is the conflict between the efficiency of adaptation and organization and the efficiency of invention and creation. What autocracy needs is the thrill and push of individual liberty and the continental peasant will get it as the result of this war, for the guns of autocracy are celebrating the downfall of autocracy, even in its most ancient fastness—Russia. These autocracies will realize their real greatness when they substitute humility for pride, freedom for accomplishment, as compelling national motives. What democracy needs is the discipline of patient labor, of trained skill, of thoroughness in work, and a more socialized conception of public duty. As President Eliot has pointed out, the German theory of social organization is very young, and her literature, philosophy and are fairly new. It is a bit premature to concede the supreme validity of her Kultur and of her political organization until she can point to such names as Dante and Angelo, Shakespeare and Milton, Newton and Darwin and Pasteur, and until such names appear in her political history as Washington and Jefferson and Burke. This is not meant to deny the surpassing greatness of her music and her philosophy, nor to minimize the glory of her Goethes or Schillers or Lessings or Steins, but to suggest that she has not yet reached the superlative. It is not yet quite sure that with all their genius for organization and efficiency, they may not be self-directed to ruin. Certainly the German has as much to learn from the freer nations as we have to learn from the Teutonic genius. Switzerland has organized her democracy and kept her personal liberty, and there is no finer spectacle on earth today than the spectacle of France, seed-sowing, torch-bearing France; France, that has touched the heights and sounded the depths of human experience and national tragedy; "*La belle France*," that has substituted duty for glory as a national motive, and has kept her soul free in the valley of humiliation; grim, patient, silent, far-seeing France, clinging to her republican

ideals and reorganizing her life from hovel to palace in the very impact of conflict and death, so that it is enabled to present to the world the finest example of organized efficiency and military glory that the world has seen in some generations. In order to organize an autocracy, the Rulers ordain that it shall get in order and provide the means to bring about that end. To organize a democracy, we must organize its soul, and give it power to create its own ideals. It is primarily a peace organization, and that is proof that it is the forward movement of the human soul and not the movement of scientific reaction. It is through a severe mental training in our schools and a return to the conception of public duty which guided the sword and uplifted the heart of the Founder of the Republic that we shall find strength to organize the democracy of the future, revolutionized by science and by urban life. The right to vote implies the duty to vote right; the right to legislate, the duty to legislate justly; the right to judge about foreign policy, the duty to fight if necessary; the right to come to college, the duty to carry one's self handsomely at college. Our youth must be taught to use their senses, to reason simply and correctly from exact knowledge thus brought to them to attain to sincerity in thought and judgment through work and patience. In our home and civic life, we need some moral equivalent for the training which somehow issues out of war—the glory of self-sacrifice, obedience to just authority, contempt of ease, and a realization that through thoughtful, collective effort great results will obtain. A great spiritual glory will come to these European nations through their sorrow and striving, which will express itself in great poems and great literature. They are preparing new shrines at which mankind will worship. Let us take care that prosperity is not our sole national endowment. War asks of men self-denials and sacrifice for ideals. Peace must somehow do the same. Autocracy orders men to forget self for an over-self called the state. Democracy must inspire men to forget self for a still higher thing called humanity.

There stands upon the steps of the Sub-Treasury building, in Wall Street, the bronze figure of an old Virginia country gentleman looking out with his honest eyes upon that sea of hurrying, gain-getting men. This statue is a remarkable allegory, for in his brave, thoughtful person, Washington embodies that form of public spirit, that balance of character, that union of force and justice that redefines democracy. Out of his lips seems to issue the great creed which is the core of democratic society, and around which this finer organization shall be solidly built. Power rests on fitness to rule. Fitness to rule rests on trained minds and spirits. You can trust men if you will train them. The object of power is the public good. The ultimate judgment of mankind in the mass is a fairly good judgment.

Social and Economic Legislation in North Carolina During the Civil War

By E. W. SIKES.

The conduct of a great war requires more than military skill. Once the mighty chieftain alone was essential, but today the strong arm of the military leader may be paralyzed by the policy of the Legislature. The efficiency of an army in modern times depends on equipment and supplies. As Lloyd George declared to the Welsh strikers, "the contest in Europe is, in the last analysis, a struggle between the workmen of the Nations, the efficiency of the mechanics of the allies is pitted against those of Central Europe."

The legislation of the Confederacy naturally falls into two parts. The first part concerns the legislation by the Confederate Congress. With that phase of it this paper has nothing to do. The second part concerns itself with State legislation, which divides itself into the general laws which concern the whole State and the local laws which concern the counties and towns. This paper, however, is limited to the acts of the General Assembly and the Convention.

The forces that took charge of the American Revolution and the French Revolution met in Provincial and Continental Congresses and Conventions, and so did North Carolina in the Civil War. When the General Assembly saw that the hour had come to act, when the tide could no longer be stemmed, it authorized the meeting of a Convention, which met in Raleigh, May 20, 1861, and is popularly known as the "Secession Convention." The Convention Bill gave this body the power to make both constitutional and statutory laws. In this respect North Carolina realized the desperateness of the struggle and did not hesitate to concentrate power in the hands of a few. This Convention was composed of able men, representing the best in the State. Out of the one hundred and forty-seven men, sixty-seven had attended college.

The first act of this Convention was to adopt the ordinance of Secession. Then it began to prepare North Carolina, not for the impending crisis, but for the conflict that was at hand. This body remained in existence from May 20, 1861, to May 13, 1862. It held four sessions of about one month each. This Convention claimed and exercised authority over the General Assembly, changed its time of meeting and declared what Convention laws it could not repeal. During the recesses of the Convention the General Assembly would convene in extra session. This body felt hampered by the existence of a body superior to it. The

Convention grew unpopular, for it was felt that it had served its purpose in passing the ordinance of Secession, and that it now "lagged superfluous on the stage." Then, too, the "original secession" element that controlled the Convention in the beginning had lost control of it. The result of it was that the economic and social legislation of 1861 and 1862 is enacted in part by the General Assembly and in part by the Convention.

FINANCING THE WAR.

After secession the first task that confronted the legislature was the financing of the military establishment.

In May, 1861, it was estimated that it would cost to equip the present number of troops \$6,625,000 per annum, but that the Confederacy would pay part of it, leaving as North Carolina's share \$3,920,000. To meet these expenses \$3,200,000 was appropriated. The total State tax at this time \$712,977.12. This \$3,200,000 was not to be raised by taxation, but otherwise. The Treasurer was authorized to borrow not over \$3,000,000, on 6 per cent bonds, payable in 12 months, also the Treasurer was authorized to issue \$200,000 of notes to circulate as money in 10 cent, 25 cent, and 50-cent denominations.

This was the first example of the State's war financing. Hopes were high, metallic money was scarce, but bonds and paper could easily be printed. This was an example of Confederate finance, but it was following in the footsteps of the Revolutionary fathers, who issued the notorious Continental money.

Each year the State increased its issues of the easily secured paper money. These State notes, like the Confederacy, were based on faith—especially the faith that is the "substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things unseen."

This was in May, 1861. In December, 1861, the Convention, in order to provide for the expenses of the ensuing year, 1862, authorized the Treasurer to issue \$3,000,000 more of circulating notes, exchangeable for 6 per cent 30-year bonds. These notes were hoarded. Confederate currency had come into the State and the people felt intuitively that though the Confederacy might fail the State would remain, therefore State money was more desirable than Confederate money.

In February, 1862, the Convention assumed the obligation of the State to pay into the Treasury of the Southern Confederacy its share of the Confederate tax of 50 cents on each \$100 worth of property. Treasury notes were again issued.

Before adjourning, the Convention, fearing lest there might be some scarcity of the circulating medium in small change, ordered the issue of an extra \$2,500,000 in small denominations. Then fearing that this

might not be enough, before final adjournment, the Treasurer was authorized to issue another \$2,000,000.

So this Convention, in one year, ordered the issue of more than \$10,000,000 of bonds and circulating notes, thus leaving a nice little State debt on September 30, 1862, of \$14,812,005.

This is enough to show the financial policy of these years. Little use was made of taxation. Today England sells bonds, but she also levies taxes. The Southern Confederacy and North Carolina learned this lesson, but only after it was too late. Secretary Memminger, the Treasurer of the Southern Confederacy, advocated taxes only in a small degree, but the Confederacy did not tax so much even as he proposed. His successor, Trenholm, realized it, but only when it was too late.

The North Carolina Treasurer realized it in November, 1864, when he declared in his report that the "only way to sustain the currency was by taxation."

This method of financing continued till in November, 1864, the State was in debt \$27,577,945.20, but by this time both the State and the Confederate financial policy was ship-wrecked—a \$100 State bond was worth just \$7.40, while a \$100 Confederate bond was worth just \$4.

SOLDIERS' FAMILIES.

But the State was not unmindful of the widow and the orphan, for there were many of them. There was probably little agitation on this subject for a year after the war began. In 1861 there were men enough at home to care for the families without public aid. Crops had been planted before the war began. The legislation of that period contented itself with decreeing that the widow should be entitled to the arrearage of the soldiers' pay. The year 1862 saw many of the men go to the front. The fierce fighting and the heavy losses in 1862 made the problem at home very serious. When the Legislature met, one of its tasks was to care for the widows. In February, 1863, \$1,000,000 was appropriated from the Treasury for this purpose. It was to be distributed through the counties. In December of the same year another \$1,000,000 was ordered, and \$3,000 for the Indian families of the warriors who had protected the western portion of the State. In May, 1864, another million was ordered to be paid to the widows in Treasury notes, and \$7,000 for the families of the Indian warriors.

In Vance's last message he recommended an appropriation of \$2,000,000 more and urged that the State must care for the widow. As far as the Legislature could care for the widow by making appropriations it did it. Then the counties, New Hanover, for example, were given the power to issue bonds for the sake of the widows.

It was easy to vote bonds and appropriate monies, but by the close of 1864 it took many bonds to care for a family. But despite millions for soldiers' widows, there was distress. That was ameliorated by the women's efforts and by the slaves. While not forgetting the heroism of the women of the Confederacy let us remember that it was the faithful, the loyal slave at home who was the most important factor in the State's economic life. Had it not been for them, the suffering at home would have compelled the return of the men. When truth shall be chiseled into marble, by the side of the woman of the Confederacy will stand her faithful slave. The military strength is no stronger than the strength at home. Slave labor was the big factor at home. How much of the ability to face a powerful foe for four years was due to the social efficiency of the slave system! Arnold Bennett says England needs no conscription, that she now has in the field all she can maintain.

SALT.

The State early realized that salt was very necessary to the success of the troops. The food supply—meat—depended on the supply of salt. The Convention took the matter up at once. In December, 1861, Dr. J. M. Worth was elected Salt Commissioner, and \$100,000 appropriated for that purpose. It was felt that 500,000 bushels would be needed.

Dr. Emmons, the State Geologist, reported that salt could be made on the sea coast. The making of it was begun there.

The Convention also appropriated \$35,000 and appointed Woodfin to make salt at Saltville, Va., where there was said to be a salt sea under ground. This salt was to be distributed to the counties, where the justices of the peace regulated its distribution, and it was not to be sold for more than cost; to sell it for a profit was criminal. Ex-Governor Graham proposed that a bounty of \$1.00 a bushel be paid, and that thus the manufacturer of salt should remain a private enterprise, but this the Convention would not do.

The Salt Commissioner in the State was given power to condemn lands and fuel, to employ free negroes and, if necessary, to impress them. All salt employees were free from military duty. A Quaker was not required to fight, but he might be required to make salt or to work in a hospital.

Woodfin in Virginia reported in November, 1862, that he had erected furnaces and kettles, had employed slaves from Warren County at \$20 per month, and that his greatest difficulty was to get food supplies. To meet these needs he agreed to refill sacks of grain with salt. So the grain supply was met. To get his beef, he sent to the mountains and drove down a herd of cattle. The hides were tanned by Rankin, Gaines

& Company of Asheville for half the leather. From Nash, Johnston, Wayne and Pitt he got bacon in exchange for salt; from Randolph County he secured 4,500 yards ozanburg to make clothes for the slaves and salt bags in exchange for salt, from Lenoir 37,000 pounds of kettle. In November he wrote that 100,000 bushels would be needed to save the pork crop, and that he expected to make that much during the winter. He urged upon the pork makers to kill in installments—December, January, February—so that he might keep them in salt. The Sunday problem confronted him, but he decided that it was necessary to keep his furnaces and kettles going on Sunday. He estimated that it was costing about 50 cents a bushel. Various states bought salt at this place, but North Carolina was the only State that owned and managed its salt concern.

The great trouble was distribution. Some counties allowed the wagoners one-half for hauling, and thus appeared, even in the salt-making, the head of the ubiquitous speculator.

Woodfin wished to repay the Treasury by setting aside 25 cents on every bushel as a sinking fund. As late as the end of 1864 Woodfin was still making salt at Saltville. D. G. Worth had charge of the works at Wilmington. He produced from April 22, 1863 to 1864, 62,000 bushels. While the price in Wilmington was \$19 a bushel the State was making it at \$7.75.

The works at Wilmington were claimed by Gen. Whiting to interfere with military matters. One evening the Federals captured 47 of Worth's salt workers. Worth was equipped in 1864 with 52 mules and 5,000 pounds of bacon, but in February he was ordered to remove from Wilmington. The *Standard* in March, 1862, had said, "The greatest difficulty in the way of the South in the present struggle is the want of salt. We can do without many things but salt is a vital article." So vital was it that a Raleigh merchant at one time was asking \$100 per bushel, but Col. T. G. Whitaker, the salt agent for Wake, had ordered 6,000 bushels which he sold for \$2.50 per bushel.

The State early realized this necessity for salt and did not dally, but kept up the making of salt and its delivery to the counties all during the war. It was not the salt, but the pork that the salt would save that was wanted. There were some attempts made at salt making by private concerns. In 1862 a charter was granted to the Chatham Salt Mining and Manufacturing Company. Various devices were used by families to make salt, but these efforts have nothing to do with State legislation.

LIQUOR.

A tax of 30 cents a gallon was placed on all liquors made of grain. This law was to continue till April, 1862, when all distillation from

grain was forbidden. Brandies are not mentioned. A \$1 tax was placed on all liquors made outside of the State and imported. This was no triumph for the prohibitionists. The motive behind this legislation was the preservation of the grain for the food supply.

In December, 1862, the Governor was authorized to appoint a commissioner to buy up food and provisions and to sell first to the families of soldiers and then forward to the army; \$500,000 was appropriated for this purpose. To buy food ostensibly for the army, the State, or the Confederacy, when, in fact, it was for the purpose of speculation, was made a criminal offense with six months in prison or a \$500 fine.

ENGROSSING.

As in every country that is steeped in woe there are those who fatten on her distress, so in North Carolina, while many of her sons were preparing to give up their lives in the field, there were others at home who were trying to make gain out of their suffering. He was the forestaller or engrosser. It was, therefore, made unlawful to buy foodstuffs and hold for unreasonable profits; the forestaller was defined as "one who buys to keep the product off the market"; the unlawful conspirator is "one who enters into an agreement in regard to the sale." Trading with the enemy was forbidden in 1861, and the penalty was \$2,000 fine or six months imprisonment. Both sides legislated on this subject, but when the lines were close together the trading proceeded all the same.

RAILROADS.

Railroads were chartered for various parts of the State. Most of these had already been chartered, and the legislation was simply amendatory. The State wanted a railway from the coal fields in Chatham to the North Carolina Railway. Another road was wanted from Cheraw to these same fields.

Another road was to go from Fayetteville to Florence; another was to connect the Western North Carolina road with the iron and salt region of Virginia.

Many manufacturing companies were organized such as the Lockville Company and the Fayetteville Kerosene Company. These enterprises were too imposing for the conditions of that time, but the State did undertake to solve the problem of clothing, by encouraging the manufacture of woolen and cotton goods. There were willing hands in the South, for they were those of mothers, sisters, or faithful slaves, who would card and spin through the long, lonely evenings, if they only had the cards. The Legislature agreed to make a 6 per cent loan to any person who would manufacture them, but would not loan more than

\$10,000. The best aid in this direction came from the successful blockaders who represented the State and brought in 55,000 pairs of cards.

BLOCKADING.

Of all the social legislation of the period the most effective was the appointment of the Governor himself to be the chief of those sturdy seamen who ran the blockade. Vance held in tenderest regard this phase of State work, and he was wise in it. A million bonds issued to the soldiers' widows, or an extra million of Treasury notes, fed none of the hungry, produced not a bushel of wheat or corn, nor made a blanket or pair of shoes, but every blockade runner brought some material comfort. Germany has her great chest of gold, but it is not gold that Germany wants; it is food and ammunition. Vance's blockaders were the foreign traders of North Carolina. His most noble cruiser, the *Ad-Vance*, was worth more than all the other cruisers of the Confederacy combined.

In his report of 1864-1865 he says that he has sold 55,000 pairs of cards, 7,000 yards of cloth, and has on hand 35,000 yards of D. W. Army cloth, 28,886 blankets, 10,000 needles, 150 barrels of bluestone.

During the war the Insane Hospital, Deaf and Blind Institute, and the Public School System were sustained.

In conclusion let me say that every main line of railway in the State had been mapped out before the war—the Seaboard Air Line, the Southern, and the Atlantic Coast Line, only the Norfolk Southern has come since the war.

North Carolina, as well as the whole South, was undergoing a social and economic renaissance when the war came. We were already caring for the insane, the deaf and blind, the public school was in full force, and railroads were being built. The last decade, 1850-1860, witnessed the rapid development of Southern enterprises as the following figures will show. The South had not become petrified nor static; the dynamic energy displayed by the South since the war was already here.

One-third of the yarns were being spun in the South.

Cotton manufacturing in that decade had increased 43 per cent.

Virginia, North Carolina and Alabama products were worth \$1,000,000.

Manufacturing of woolen goods increased 143 per cent—the largest increase in the nation.

In carding wool the South was next to the Northwest.

Boots and shoes increased 89 per cent.

Paper-making increased 700 per cent.

Coal: Virginia, 70 per cent; Alabama, 236 per cent; Kentucky, 200 per cent.

Sheet iron and railroad bars, 63 per cent; agricultural implements, 50 per cent.

The war did not make the South industrial. It was already moving in that direction. Without the war it would have become such.

Somebody lost \$200,000,000 by the freeing of the slaves in North Carolina, but they lost only the titles to them. As an economic factor, the slave remained as the emancipated negro. Society in the South changed from slave labor to free labor. The great economic loss in the South was not emancipation for the emancipated ploughed the fields and gathered the grain after the war as they did before. The great loss came in those who returned not from the battlefields.

Union Sentiment in North Carolina During the Civil War

BY MARY SHANNON SMITH.

Since the beginning of the great European War, we have realized anew how difficult it is to get at the real truth of history, and that most events that bring about profound changes have various elements which are almost impossible to analyze. Facts may be recorded, but motives, causes, purposes—the unseen forces of thought which lie back of all the rest—these are more elusive.

In any country under stress where there is continued unanimity of action it would appear to come from strong social control of thought and conduct, indifference, ignorance, or some colossal danger. An alert and thinking people are in time bound to differ.

As North Carolina has always stood for individualism, and as there was much divergence of thought down to the war, it would be most unusual if the outward Act of Secession in April, 1861, would for long make the minds of all the people run in the same channel, although the sudden shock or social control might for a time, at least, make them appear to do so. One learns to make allowances on both sides for expressions of partisanship and to realize that usually the real conditions are somewhat different from the strongly emotional contentions of either side. For, as in the present great war, any divergence of feeling North or South would have been kept as far as possible within the lines and those in control would try to minimize the divergence.

The horrible blunders of Congress in the administration of the South during the period of reconstruction, which compelled all elements of the people to unite, have largely made us overlook the different state of mind during the war itself.

This paper is based largely on the files of the *Fayetteville Observer* from July, 1853, through December, 1864, and on three large bound volumes of "Hale Papers" from 1850 to 1865. *The Observer* until the outbreak of the war was Whig and strongly Union; during the war it was unfailingly loyal to the Southern cause, and from the election of Governor Vance in 1862 to the close of the war it particularly represented his administration. The paper was one of the ablest in the State and of commanding influence. The private papers comprise a large number of personal letters, many of them confidential, from the most prominent men in the State. So far as known they have never before been read except by the Hale family and at the office of the State

Historical Commission. Such material should reflect most unconsciously and therefore accurately the prevailing sentiment of the State. It is an interesting experience in studying a momentous period in history to forget the present and live again with those who are recording and interpreting the events, especially with one who in personality and training looks at life in a large way. Such an interpreter was Edward J. Hale, in the pages of whose paper the past of North Carolina, our country, and the world live again. While going through the files of these papers, the writer most unexpectedly had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Edward J. Hale 2d, of Fayetteville, now United States Minister to Costa Rica. He said that the *Observer* continued to be printed until Johnston's army marched through the town. It was then for a time suspended and the files of the paper hurriedly buried. The private papers have at different times been through fire, water and smoke, so that numbers of them are somewhat difficult to read and the edges burned.

On April 15 of 1861 the *Fayetteville Observer* carried an advertisement from Greensboro—Prospectus of the "Stars and Stripes." This was to be a three-months campaign paper for the Union, during which it was hoped to reach "the great public ear of the State."¹

In the same issue there occurred in small type the headline "Sensation Dispatches." Of these Mr. Hale says: "But the oddest part of the affair is that the [*Petersburg*] *Express* should publish this dispatch with such blood and thunder heading just above the 'very latest,' showing that the story was an arrant humbug."²

But farther on we find, "The War Commenced!!" "Bombardment of Fort Sumter!!!" The statements at first are hardly credited, then as more and more reports come, Mr. Hale says:

"This is dreadful news. War is a terrible evil. Civil war the worst of all earthly evils. Nothing but dire necessity can justify it. We are too imperfectly advised as yet of the causes to pronounce decidedly whether that necessity existed in this case. Let us wait for something more definite and reliable than the telegraph furnishes. * * *

Let us wait. And let us wait long before we unite our destinies with those of a people who have ignored us, our interests, feelings, and honor, from first to last. If we should be impelled to separate from the Union, *let us take care of ourselves.*"³

In the issue seven days later we are shown the instantaneous and thrilling effect of Lincoln's proclamation calling for seventy-five thousand troops and asking North Carolina to send her quota. To this Governor Ellis replied: "You can get no troops from North Carolina."

¹*Fayetteville Observer*, April 15, 1861, p. 2.

²*Ibid.*, p. 3.

³*Ibid.*, p. 3.

Mr. Hale in an editorial says: "Will she do it? Ought she to do it? No. No. Not a man can leave her borders upon such an errand, who has not made up his mind to war upon his own home and all that he holds dear in that home. For ourselves we are Southern men and North Carolinians, and at war with those who are at war with the South and North Carolina."⁴

Governor John W. Ellis had on the 17th called a special session of the Legislature to meet on May first; ordered seized the coast forts and the United States arsenal at Fayetteville; and called for volunteers.⁵

The Observer quotes an article from the *Raleigh Standard* which shows that the "Unionists" of North Carolina will all stand by the South when it is attacked. This is particularly to be noticed as in February the people had voted against calling a Convention to consider the relations of the State to the Federal Union 47,333 to 46,672 and at the same time had elected eighty-three Union delegates to thirty-seven Disunion delegates in case a Convention was held.⁶

The Legislature on May 1 passed an act providing for an election on May 17 of delegates to a Convention to meet on May 20. The Legislature also voted various measures in preparation for war.⁷

When the Convention met in the Commons Hall of the Capitol, one hundred and sixteen delegates were present and four absent. It had as members many of the most influential men in the State.

While a preliminary vote seemed to show forty-nine for the Badger theory of revolution and sixty-six for the Secession ordinance of Craige, the Craige ordinance was finally unanimously adopted.⁸ One of the members years afterward wrote: "I remember well that when the act of Secession was consummated the body looked like a sea, partly in storm, partly calm, the Secessionists shouting and throwing up their hats and rejoicing, the Conservatives sitting quietly, calm, and depressed."⁹ A week later North Carolina joined the Confederacy. Yet even during these early days we find slight references to individual uncertainty or difference of opinion.¹⁰

While these things were happening in the South, the North, equally thrilled by the firing on Fort Sumter, was for the time seemingly fused into one party and ready to crush, if possible, all opposition to the policy of the government.

This seeming unanimity of opinion North and South, we must remember, was at the beginning of the struggle, when few on either side real-

⁴*Fayetteville Observer*, April 22, 1861.

⁵Hill, *Young People's History of North Carolina*, p. 271.

⁶*North Carolina Manual*, 1913, pp. 1013-1015, 1018, Note 10.

⁷*Senate and House Journals*, 1860-1861.

⁸*Journal of the State Convention*, 1861, pp. 3-17, also *Fayetteville Observer*, May 27, 1861, p. 1.

⁹Holden, *Memoirs*, p. 17.

¹⁰*Fayetteville Observer*, Jan. 20, 1862, pp. 2-3; Jan. 27, 1862; Feb. 3, 1862, pp. 2-3; Feb. 10, 1862, p. 3.

ized what the actual conflict would mean. That there was later much divergence in the North is well known; that there would also be honest difference of opinion in the South was also to be expected. These differences were more or less unorganized during the first year or two of the war, though the newspapers by 1862 reflect the tendency to criticism. The independence of the press and its freedom from arrest under both the State and Confederate Constitutions is an important fact to remember.

An example of the conditions developing in the State is shown in a private letter from William J. Yates, editor of the *Charlotte Democrat*, to Mr. Hale, dated August 18, 1862, discussing conditions in Forsyth, in the course of which he says:

I think, though, it is not best to make some things known to the public at this time; therefore I have refrained from giving information of disaffection in certain localities through my paper. I have not published one-sixteenth part of what I have heard, because I dislike for the public outside of the State to know that we have any Tories in the State * * * a large portion of our population is disaffected. The conscript law has cooled the patriotism of many alarmingly, and I know of some who were very patriotic in words before that law went into operation, but who now manifest anything else but the right spirit—they are tired of the war, and say they are willing for anything to stop it.

In the summer of 1862 came the biennial election for Governor, the first since the war. There were no regular conventions held and no platforms adopted, but leading newspapers suggested candidates and some county meetings were held. Col. William Johnston, President of the Charlotte and South Carolina Railroad, was the candidate of the Democratic papers, while Col. Zebulon Baird Vance, who had been brought forward by Holden of the *Standard* and supported by the *Observer* and other leading papers, opposed Johnston and was elected by over 30,000 majority.

This election was interpreted by some as unfavorable to the Confederate Government, as Colonel Johnston was a Democrat, while before the war Vance had been a Union man. Some of the Northern papers misinterpreted the election in this way, as some historians have since,¹¹ but Vance had been in the army from the outbreak of the war and was to show as Governor his loyalty to the State of North Carolina and the South.

All through the following winter the *Observer* reflects the conflicting reports of conditions in the State. In an editorial on the interference of the *Richmond Enquirer* in the affairs of North Carolina Mr. Hale says:

¹¹*Fayetteville Observer*, Sept. 1, 1862; Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, p. 283.

And yet forsooth these Virginians lecture her upon loyalty and duty; falsely charge her with entertaining a "plot" to overthrow the government, and insinuate that she has a lurking hope of a restoration or reconstruction of the defunct and despised Union. And one of the high officers of the Confederate Government, whose duties bring him in contact with thousands of North Carolinians, both civilians and soldiers, insolently and falsely calls her "a damned nest of traitors," for which, if President Davis has a proper idea of what is due himself and to an insulted State, he will pitch the slanderer out of the office he disgraces.¹²

In the next issue there is an editorial showing how certain newspapers in Virginia, as the *Richmond Enquirer*, and in South Carolina, slander the State, though Mr. Hale admits that they are moved by certain journals in North Carolina itself, "which," as he says, "have no State feeling." Twice during March the *Observer* appeals to the press for the sake of the cause to stop wrangling and making charges of unfaithfulness which are calculated to encourage the enemy as much as a great victory.¹³

We are approaching the summer of 1863, when the discontent was to be organized and find a leader in the editor of the *Raleigh Standard*, W. W. Holden, who had been a power in the political history of the State since about 1850 and had brought forward Vance as a candidate for Governor in 1862.

The history of the State through the war was so largely moulded by these two leaders that their attitude toward the State, the Confederacy and the war should be most carefully studied.

In the biography of Jefferson Davis, written by a brilliant native of North Carolina, the idea is given that Vance and Holden worked together in opposing the Confederacy and for peace.¹⁴ As the book was published in 1907 Mr. Dodd's sources were, I assume, the *Official Records of the War of the Rebellion* which contains only Governor Vance's controversies with President Davis. The Vance and the Hale papers had not then been made available for historical purposes. In these sources, many of which were confidential letters written in the stress of the times, the evidence seems irrefutable that Vance and Holden broke with each other in the summer of 1863 over the issue of the Peace meetings, Governor Vance continuing to work for the Southern cause throughout the war.

Before discussing the "Peace Movement" it may be well to say a word about Jefferson Davis and the Confederacy. In a most interesting paper on "A Theory of Jefferson Davis" in the *American Historical Review* for October, 1915, Mr. W. W. Stephenson of Charleston, South Carolina, writing of the central fact of Davis's youth, says:

¹²*Fayetteville Observer*, January 12, 1863, p. 3.

¹³*Ibid.*, March 5, 1863, p. 3; March 26, 1863, p. 3.

¹⁴William E. Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, pp. 283, 301, 337-340.

* * * He was a boy without a country * * * his was a migratory growth, frequently transplanted¹⁵ * * * The army must to a considerable extent have been his country * * * Long afterward, in his final crisis, Davis failed to appreciate a certain type of man. It was a type in which love of one's community had become a passion. To that type he appeared in those stern days to be a monster. To him, apparently, the crushing of that type seemed a matter of course.¹⁶

Again Mr. Stephenson says:

Davis at the outset of his career accepted the political theories, the political phraseology, of the States' Rights party * * * For fifteen years he had talked one thing while he meant another; talked the constitutional rights of the individual States, while what he really meant was the economic interests of a consolidated South. * * * He clung to the phraseology of States' rights as stubbornly even as Rhett or Stephens, who genuinely believed in it. And yet when occasion finally tested him, behind his words, striking through his words, appears something quite different—the Southern Nationalist.¹⁷ * * * The internal history of the Confederacy is largely the battle of these irreconcilable ideals¹⁸ * * * His States' rights phraseology and his long series of centralizing measures appeared to them irreconcilable.¹⁹ * * * He became the prisoner of an illusion.²⁰

The able paper on the "Relations Between the Confederate States Government and the Government of North Carolina," given by Judge Montgomery before this Association in 1913, reveals clearly this element in the situation.²¹

Mr. Dodd in writing of the general condition of the Southern Government at the beginning of 1863, says: "The commanders of the troops were at loggerheads; parties and cliques had grown up; and the President was not implicitly trusted by the people."²²

Between these two forces of the State and the Confederacy stood Vance. On the one side he must safeguard the rights of the Sovereign State of North Carolina which he thought were being threatened, and, on the other, he must hold the State loyal to the Confederacy to which she had pledged her faith.

On June 10th he wrote a private letter to Mr. Hale asking him to come to Raleigh. This is thought to be the beginning of the association of Governor Vance and Mr. Hale, although they knew each other before. In this letter Governor Vance says:

¹⁵W. W. Stephenson, "A Theory of Jefferson Davis," in *American Historical Review*, Vol. XXI, pp. 73-74.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 87.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

²⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

²¹Walter A. Montgomery, "Relations Between the Confederate States Government and the Government of North Carolina," *Proceedings North Carolina Literary and Historical Association*, 1913, pp. 35-55.

²²William E. Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, p. 299.

I wish to talk with you about some matters seriously affecting the *status* of the party which elevated me to office, and perhaps the good of the Confederate cause itself, and I hardly wish to put anything I desire to say on paper. I make this request of you as being more nearly of my *precise stripe* politically—past and present—than any other editor in the State, and as the undisputed organ of the war element of the old Whigs.

Things are moving here in a manner calculated to give *such a Whig* uneasiness, and I desire advice and consultation. I hope to see Mr. Graham this week.

In a letter from Dr. Kemp P. Battle from Raleigh to Mr. Hale, July 3, 1863, he adds this confidential note: —

I am afraid there is growing a split in the Conservative party; *e. g.*, Vance and yourself on one side, and on the other those who love to thwart and carp at the Confederate Government and the war.

In a confidential letter dated July 26, 1863, from Governor Vance to Mr. Hale he says:

I assure you I am deeply concerned at the turn things have taken. I asked Mr. Graham, Governor Swain, and others to talk to Holden, but it has done little good; he pretends, and maybe really is of the opinion, that four-fifths of the people are ready for reconstruction, and says he is only following the people, not leading them. This is not true in fact. He is responsible for half this feeling at least, if it exists. Of course, the driver sits behind the team and yet may be said to follow his horses.

I had a long talk with him yesterday, and requested him to say in his paper that he was not my organ on this matter and did not speak my sentiments. He promised to do so. I think it all-important that the people should know my sentiments, so that should there be a split he may not be committing to him any persons under the idea that he was my friend, which I think likely accounts for much of his popularity.

During August the letters to Mr. Hale are numerous; practically all of them discuss the growing dissatisfaction in the State. Quotations follow from those of Governor Vance, and a few others.

In a long, closely written letter from P. W. Stanback, Little Mills, August, 1863, he says:

Times, as you may agree with me, look exceedingly gloomy for us * * * our late reverses seem to have emboldened a few bad spirits among us; they have seized the opportune moment to encourage the disaffection that they know to have existed among the lower classes of our rural population, who (very many at least) have long entertained prejudices against the property holder, especially against slave owners. They persistingly regard this war as gotten up for their exclusive benefit; that they have no part or interest in it; that the burdens fall unduly heavy upon them; they, therefore, became greatly dissatisfied with both the exemption and conscription laws, especially so with the former as giving to the slave owner immunities and advantages over them on account of their property. This being the case, I have held * * *

that the [] means should have pursued towards them a conciliatory course; to lend them, as far as practicable, a helping hand, and this from principle no less than policy.

A letter from Thomas S. Ashe, member of Confederate Congress 1862-1864, Supreme Court Judge 1879-1887, and dated August 5, 1863, Wadesboro, to Mr. Hale, in which he mentions that he is again to run for Congress and needs advice, and also says:

* * * but I am really fearful that if we had an armistice we should never be able to get our people to fight again, and that reunion would be the result. * * * But I tell you, my dear Sir, that I believe that there is a purpose (now latent) on the part of the leaders of the peace movement to carry our State back into the United States. They are just now cautiously feeling their way through these meetings, but if our reverses continue it will not be long before an organized party in the State advocating that measure will assume shape and form, and will be headed by prominent men.

A letter from Governor Vance August 11, 1863, reports a successful visit to President Davis, where they discussed North Carolina affairs and Davis gave Vance authority to do certain things. He then adds:

I believe, however, the split with Holden is decreed of the gods. I have made up my mind to it * * * He is for submission, reconstruction, or anything else that will put him back under Lincoln and stop the war—and, I might add, punish his old friends and collaborators.

Pitch into them—cry aloud and spare not—my life—popularity, and everything shall go into this contest.

A long confidential eight-page letter from Morganton, August 29, 1863,* reports at length the disloyalty in the mountain section of the State, and continues:

I know not how it is elsewhere, but this part of the State is in a deplorable condition—on the very edge, indeed, of civil strife and butchery. The mountains are full of deserters, who are banded together and emboldened by a disloyal public opinion, which is daily finding expression in popular assemblages and otherwise. All persons are beginning to feel that sense of insecurity which is at once the cause and the effect of internal commotion, and presages a speedy appeal to arms unless arrested. The root of the whole matter is a deadly hostility to our cause and our Government, notwithstanding the specious pretext under which it is sought to be covered up. [Illegible from effects of fire, smoke, and water.]

It is pretended again that North Carolina has been put upon and slighted; but how comes it that when the Confederate Government backs down and almost gets on its knees to apologize, these men still feel affronted and will accept no satisfaction? * * * If the grounds of complaint alluded to did not exist they would find others. Now it seems to me that before we can take

*Only the initials V. C. remain of the signature to this letter, but by comparing it with other letters in the collection it seems to have been written by V. C. Barringer, of Concord.

the first step toward a cure we must understand something of the nature of the disease. We must boldly recognize the fact that there are in North Carolina, and have been from the start, a considerable body of men—many of them influential—who have been secretly and desperately opposed to our whole movement, who acquiesced in the incipient stages of the revolution only because they could not help themselves, and who today prefer the old Union to the Confederacy. [Illegible from effects of fire and water] last a mass and strength of popular feeling setting in against the Confederacy which is as certain to entail upon us civil war in North Carolina as that the sun is in the heaven—” [He then explains they expect to follow forms of law and elect as many peace men as possible to Congress, and also get control of the State Government.]

The whole thing is managed with a skill and an energy that show the hand of a master schemer.

The writer expresses the opinion that North Carolina is more liable to change and “to be played upon by sophists and calculators than any of the Confederate States proper except Tennessee.”

As remedies he suggests:

1. The loyal press must discuss the whole question fully before the people.

Unfortunately, we got divided, hotly divided, about the secession of the State in the winter of '61—one side lauding the old Union and the other side the new Confederacy—when Lincoln's proclamation, like a clap of thunder, startled and united both sides. But it was not, I affirm, a union based upon any intelligent and heartfelt popular conviction of the truth [illegible from effects of fire and water] attachment to the Union unshaken [illegible] hear the Confederate Government denounced as we see it daily denounced, is it any wonder that they should feel those attachments rather strengthened, and that they have been led into a causeless rebellion? I speak what I know, when I say that many persons believe that the Davis government is a more galling tyranny than Lincoln's. I do not mean, of course, that we should give Davis unmixed praise. [Explains that the right of separation should be explained to the people.] Crime and the guilt of crime is associated in the common mind with the hateful names of rebel and traitor. Our people, indeed, no people, can sustain long the weight of the conviction that they are incurring every day the punishment due to the darkest deeds known in the catalogue of human crimes. We ought, if we cannot do better, at least take the ground assumed by Washington in the contest between England and the Colonies, that we are fighting under the *de facto* government of the State, and as such are not guilty, even in the view of the English law of treason. Until something is done to remove this fatal impression, I cannot hope for any permanent good among our people. Let them feel that they are right in morals and in law, and we hope all things, come though disasters may be as thick as blackberries.

2. But, secondly and chiefly, a line ought to be drawn between the friends of Governor Vance and Holden. No true man doubts the integrity or the loyalty of the former, every true man must doubt that of the latter * * * You have no idea of the extent of his circulation. I have found his paper in every nook and corner of the mountains. Now, with such a man you cannot mince matters. True wisdom dictates that the sooner you break with him

the better; and I believe that if the friends of Governor Vance will boldly and at once shake him off, the State may be saved. Otherwise, unless we have a successful peace, he will wind the State around his fingers as he pleases and snap them in Governor Vance's face.

I have written more than I intended. I am really alarmed for the first time during the war as to the fate of North Carolina. I am ashamed of the figure she is made to cut before her friends and her enemies.

A most interesting letter is one from Aldert Smedes, of St. Mary's School, Raleigh, August 31, 1863, in which he thanks Mr. Hale for his article replying to the *Standard*, and then says:

But it seems to me that such heavy ordnance as you have used against him is directed at game too small. Holden is not really at the bottom of the disaffection in this State. He is merely the mouthpiece of the discontented, or the vane which shows the direction of the angry currents of popular feeling.

The principal cause of our present troubles in this State is to be found in the stomach, rather than in the heads and hearts of our people. Gentlemen, the great majority of our people cannot buy the necessaries of life at the present enormous prices! Starvation not only stares them in the face, but actually begins to work within them, and we know what a depressing [illegible] influence upon the temper and views of men enforced hunger produces. People who cannot get enough to eat are in a mood to grumble at everything. What wonder, then, that they should vent their spleen upon the war, which is the immediate cause of their suffering.

I confess I do not wonder that the patriotism of some waxes cold and their wrath hot when they look at the state of things around them.

Dr. Smedes then goes on to speak of the rich men who by high prices are extorting money from the poor, and says that they and not Mr. Holden are the worst enemies of the country.

Realizing the alarming condition of affairs, Mr. Hale changes the policy of attack and from minimizing the divergence, in a series of strong editorials beginning August 17th, boldly faces the issue in the open. He says:

It can no longer be doubted or denied that there is a division in public sentiment in North Carolina—on the one hand a determination to resist subjugation by the Yankee government and to achieve the independence of the Confederacy, on the other a peace party, as it is falsely called, that would be willing to have independence, but clamors for peace with or without independence.

He says the first are led by Governor Vance and the latter by the *Raleigh Standard*, though it is not so radical as some of its followers.²³

As these editorials continue Mr. Hale is in receipt of various letters reporting the good effects they are having throughout the State and enclosing new subscriptions to the paper.

²³*Fayetteville Observer*, August 17, 1863, p. 3.

That the conditions in the State were critical is shown by a most important "Address of the army to the people of North Carolina" that appeared in the same issue of the *Observer* signed by seven officers, among whom were Colonel Thomas Garrett of Bertie County and Colonel Bryan Grimes of Pitt County. This was an appeal to the people to resist any effort toward factions; it discusses the questions at issue and explains why they should stand together. The appeal goes on to show the danger to the State of these tendencies and that they might lead to civil conflict within the State, as in Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri.²⁴

The following independent accounts of a conference between Governor Vance, Governor Graham, Mr. Satterthwaite, a member of the Governor's Council, and Mr. Holden are especially important as showing the opposite positions held by Vance and Holden:

A letter from Governor Vance to Mr. Hale, September 7, 1863, from Raleigh, refers to a conference which Mr. Hale could not attend, but Governor Graham and Mr. Satterthwaite did. He read them letters from about thirty leading Whigs of the State, "all concurring in my views of duty."

We sent for Holden and Governor Graham & talked to him earnestly for three hours. It would do no good—he would agree to nothing and insisted that the meetings should go on and I nor no one else should say a word! Modest proposition truly. I offered to keep silent if he would discourage the meetings—would not agree to it. Governor Graham was clear that I should issue a proclamation, but insisted it should be very mild and cautious. I have accordingly written one which will appear tomorrow, but I do assure you it is not the document my judgment would have dictated, but I yielded to Mr. Graham's better advice. I do not know that I will publish [burnt] unless my friends should think it of sufficient importance. I had prepared a lengthy letter going into the argument of the case fully, but it was thought best to adopt another mode.

From my many letters and my own knowledge of the men holding these meetings, the metal is very small—I expect the peace men really have a majority to start with but the brains are largely with us * * * I am very hopeful of the contest. [He then suggests the policy Mr. Hale is to pursue toward Holden in his paper.]

Don't let him deceive you. He is for reconstruction out and out. Write me often.

Many years later Mr. Holden wrote the following account of the conference:

A short time after this Governor Graham was invited to Raleigh, and I was sent for to come down and meet him at the Governor's Mansion. I went down in company with F. E. Satterthwaite, Esquire, of Washington, N. C. Mr. Satterthwaite agreed with me, but took no part in the conversation. Governor Graham and Vance and myself talked for a long time on the state

²⁴*Payetteville Observer*, September 7, 1863, p. 4.

of the country. About that time I was publishing a series of proceedings of peace meetings in various counties. Governor Vance was opposed to them. I told him the people had a right to assemble and express their opinions and petition for redress of grievances, but I did not approve of propositions to return to the Union unconditionally; yet the people who held these meetings were the men who elected him Governor. Governor Graham, in this respect, seemed to concur with me more than Governor Vance.²⁵ * * *

This was the beginning of the wide separation between Governor Vance and myself, which resulted in my opposing him for Governor in 1864, and here I may say, and do say in the most emphatic manner, that I have never questioned his integrity, nor his honor, nor the sincerity of his devotion to his principles, or to the people whose servant he was and is.²⁶

Just at this time Raleigh—with a population of between four and five thousand—was thrown into great excitement by a mob which broke up part of the office of the *Raleigh Standard*, while the following morning another destroyed the office of the *State Journal*.²⁷

Governor Vance took hold of the situation vigorously and the excitement seemed in a few weeks to have largely subsided. Mr. Holden in a letter to Mr. Hale, October 7th, writes that of course after the mob he could not change his policy, but the height of the excitement over the peace meetings seemed over and in a letter dated October 26th Governor Vance writes: "I receive continued evidence of a better state of feeling in the State." But December 10th in another private letter he says: "But the Holdenites are making every effort to raise a row again. God help us. I fear we are on the eve of another revolution and civil war in the State."

A letter from Governor Vance who has been ill and still not well, dated December 21, 1863, in the course of which he says:

What would you say to Congress app'g Commrs to treat for peace? Would it do any good, North or South? Their terms would not be heard, of course, and it might help to put down the clamor here. Many of our friends here think it the only way to save North Carolina, and I confess I have been somewhat moved by their arguments, but am fearful to yield my position on such without good advice. Mr. Graham was much depressed whilst here on the subject, for though we suppressed the resolutions in the caucus, yet there was dissatisfaction among men of whom you would have thought better things. Don't think me faint-hearted—I have been sick and quite gloomy.

But the contest was to assume a new form, that of a Convention which was to be made the issue of the State campaign in 1864. To show that Governor Vance felt himself the servant of all the people and of the peace movement which he had fought in the State itself, we have his letter to Mr. Hale dated December 30, 1863.

²⁵Holden, *Memoirs*, p. 24, also pp. 76-77.

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 25.

²⁷*Fayetteville Observer*, September 14, 1863, p. 3.

He had written Mr. Dortch as to the propriety of offering terms of peace in Congress. "He saw the President, who was not quite convinced of its propriety, but would consult about it." Governor Vance inclines to think more than ever it could do no harm "and would silence clamor of a certain few in North Carolina or force them to take sides against their country, which most of them are afraid to do while we still have two great armies in the field."

He gives as another reason that the plans are all arranged to advocate a Convention in the spring. This is to test Vance and he is to be beaten if he opposes it. He says: "I want the question narrowed down to *Lincoln or no Lincoln*, and don't intend to fritter away my strength on any minor issues."

A long important letter dated January 16, 1864, from D. K. McRae, who had just returned from discussing affairs at Richmond, expresses the opinion that a party strong in numbers—having an organ not unsuited to the position and determined in purpose has entered upon a plan by which the State at no distant day is to be carried out of the Confederacy." He reports having discussed the matter plainly with President Davis. "I recommended sharp and decisive measures, to wit, the suspension of the writ of Habeas Corpus and the declaration of martial law, the arrest of the most guilty parties and the employment of a sufficient force to carry the laws of Congress into thorough execution."

In a letter from Governor Vance to Mr. Hale, dated January 22, 1864, he writes that many good men are alarmed over the talk, among the disaffected, about losing their liberties as *Habeas Corpus*. He asks Mr. Hale to read some documents sent him which tell of the overthrow of the ballot in Kentucky and the conditions there, so that he may make use of it in his paper to show the disaffected the conditions.

A letter from Governor Vance, February 11, 1864, after discussing the issues, says:

I make no doubt but the Convention issue will force everything asunder and form a new party—two of them rather. I do not wish this rupture to be upon any minor issue * * * Let them [the ultra-conservatives] abuse Jeff Davis and the Secessionists to their hearts' content, so they will oppose this Convention movement and keep to their duty on the war question, and whilst I would disapprove of all this as vexatious, I hold it would be bad policy to waste my strength by quarreling with them.

Years afterward, in writing of this campaign, Mr. Holden says:

As a "peace" man, after July, 1863, I urged that this State alone, or with other Southern States, should negotiate for peace on honorable terms with the general government, as it seemed to be clear that Mr. Davis would not in any event attempt to negotiate; and as it also appeared to be clear that if

the war went to its end our subjugation was inevitable. In this I was sustained by a large majority of our people until Governor Vance's Wilkesboro speech on the 22d day of February, 1864.²⁸

During the winter of 1864 various letters were exchanged between President Davis and Governor Vance, in the course of which the Governor urged that peace negotiations be opened with the Federals. President Davis shows the obstacles in the way and also advises him to abandon his policy of conciliation toward the promoters of discontent and set them at defiance. Governor Vance's well known letter to President Davis on *Habeas Corpus* strongly sets forth the discontent in the State, but he says: "Where and when have our people failed you in battle or withheld either their blood or their vast resources?"²⁹

As is well known, Holden ran for Governor in opposition to Vance and the campaign was waged into the summer. The files of the *Observer* are missing for some months, but from the official record the vote for Governor was: Vance, 58,065; Holden, 14,471.³⁰ This strong endorsement of Vance showed that the State would abide by his policies. The peace feeling, as will be seen, continued through the last year of the war, but much of it might be attributed to a realization of the final outcome rather than to Union sentiment.

One more effort for peace was made in November of 1864, when Mr. Poole of Bertie County offered peace resolutions in the State Senate that five commissioners be elected by the General Assembly to act with others from the other States of the Confederacy as a medium for negotiating a peace with the United States; that they request of President Davis that he arrange for a conference through the medium of these commissioners; that whenever five of the States so act the Governor communicate officially with President Davis.³¹

The *Observer* later has the following special dispatch in regard to Mr. Poole's resolutions:

The peace resolutions introduced by Mr. Poole of Bertie were tabled in the Senate today, 24 to 20. A motion to reconsider was defeated, 23 to 22.³²

Mr. Hale adds: "This result would have been more gratifying if it had been arrived at with some approach to unanimity. That such resolution should have been supported by twenty-two senators is astonishing."³³

I cannot close without a word for the masterly way in which the State affairs were managed during these years by Governor Vance and his

²⁸Holden, *Memoirs*, pp. 71-72.

²⁹Letter of January 8, 1864, quoted in *Fayetteville Observer* May 30, 1864, p. 2.

³⁰*North Carolina Manual*, 1913, p. 1000.

³¹*Fayetteville Observer*, November 28, 1864, p. 3.

³²*Ibid.*, December 5, 1864, p. 4; December 8, p. 1.

³³*Ibid.*, December 19, 1864, p. 1.

interpreter to the people, Mr. Edward J. Hale. The more the actual conditions are understood the more amazed one is at the marvelous skill these men showed in keeping the outward organization so efficient. Both had been strong Union men, both had continued so until Lincoln's call for troops. Yet when they went with the South neither swerved in his loyalty, but worked with tireless energy and gave all he had of ability and skill to her cause.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The vote on the matter of a Convention in February, 1861, indicates that North Carolina was strongly Union down to Lincoln's call for troops, April, 15, 1861.

2. The relations between the Confederacy and North Carolina were not cordial; the people felt that the State was distrusted and treated with suspicion. The feeling seemed especially strong against many of the centralizing policies of Jefferson Davis. The extremely complex conditions of affairs between the Confederacy and the State frequently placed Governor Vance in most delicate and trying situations which, with his group of able advisers, he met with great tact, firmness and ability. The evidence from his confidential correspondence with Hale proves conclusively that he was unswervingly loyal to the State and the cause of the South from the call for troops to the close of the war.

3. Granted the right of secession from the Federal Government, it would seem that a Southern State had an equal right to secede from the Confederacy, or to treat separately for peace, although whether it would have been wise to do so is, of course, an open question.

4. That there was deep and widespread dissatisfaction with the war is evident. That there was a strong undercurrent for the Union seems probable. Either side may admire the consistent course of action of one whose fundamental belief differs from his, but who is loyal to the truth as he believes it. As with the loyalists in the Revolutionary War, the Union element in the Civil War may be accorded honesty of conviction and a right to their opinion. Any other course would strike at the basis of the glory of North Carolina's past, whose foundation is the democratic doctrine of the right of the people to self-government and to self-expression of thought.

5. Of a State with such an undercurrent of faction that could subordinate personal feeling and with one hundred and fifteen thousand voters send into the field one hundred and twenty-five thousand troops, one can only say, as Daniel Webster did of his own State years ago: She needs no encomium. There she is. Behold her, and judge for yourselves.

The Southern Policy of Andrew Johnson

BY J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON.

In the early morning of April 15, 1865, the tragedy of Lincoln's assassination having taken place the night before, Chief Justice Chase administered the oath of office to Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, who now became President of the United States. A glance at his previous career makes it plain that, while possibly because of temperament and certainly because of former political affiliations, he was unsuited to cope with the vexing problems which had menaced his illustrious predecessor and which now confronted him, he was, nevertheless, so far as experience and training in official position was concerned, better qualified for the presidency than a majority of those who have filled the place, not even excepting the one he now succeeded.

Born in Raleigh, North Carolina, in 1808, the son of a poor bank porter, who shortly thereafter gave his life to save another, he was apprenticed to a tailor at an early age and in that way learned the trade, which he professed to the end of his life. Released from his service, he left North Carolina, where indeed no door of opportunity was open to him or likely to be so, journeyed to Tennessee, and located at Greeneville, a little village, the seat of Greene County. There he worked at his trade, married Eliza McCardle, a good woman, who, throughout the rest of his life, was an inspiration to higher and better things, and, not the least of his activities, discussed with radical intensity the political questions of the day in which he had a keen and, one may almost say, instinctive interest. He was heavily handicapped in the race for political preferment upon which he soon entered. He had learned to read in Raleigh, but it was his wife who taught him to write, and what other education he acquired was with pain and difficulty. But, serving in turn as alderman and mayor of Greeneville, he next represented his county in the lower house of the legislature in 1835 and 1839. He was an unsuccessful candidate for presidential elector in 1840 and a member of the state Senate from 1841 to 1843. He was then a successful aspirant for Congress, where he remained for ten years (1843-1853). Defeated for governor in 1851, he was triumphantly elected in 1853, after a campaign up to that time unparalleled for its bitter personalities, in which Johnson, appealing to the mass of the people, spared no one of those who opposed him, and with the same courage which characterized his entire career, refused to give the "satisfaction

customary among gentlemen," not because he was afraid to fight, for fear was left out of his physical, mental, and moral make-up, but because he was convinced to his own satisfaction that duelling was wrong. He, indeed, could say with truth, "These two eyes never looked upon any being in the shape of mortal man that this heart of mine feared." Serving two terms as governor, he was, in 1857, elected to the Senate of the United States where, while not of first rank, he was no unimportant figure, and where, bold as always, he matched his strength against John Bell, his powerful colleague from Tennessee, and against Jefferson Davis, then at his maximum of strength, power, and influence.

A States' Rights Democrat, a slave-holder, with no illusions in regard to the negroes and with something of the dislike of them characteristic of the class from which he was sprung, Johnson was never able to accept the doctrine of secession, not because of his dislike of secessionists, but because of his passion for the Union and the Constitution which to him always typified that Union. The Constitution provided no means of secession and therefore there existed in his opinion no right of secession. And so, during the dark days when Senator after Senator announced the secession of his State, and bade farewell to his colleagues, Johnson stood firm against all pressure and, alone of the Southern Senators, kept his seat, realizing fully the possibility, if not probability, of thereby condemning himself to perpetual exile from the home of his choice and of his love. His feeling is best expressed in his own words. Speaking on February 16, 1861, he said:

I have been told, and I have heard it repeated, that this Union is gone. It has been said in this Chamber that it is in the cold sweat of death; that in fact it is really dead, and merely lying in state waiting for the funeral obsequies to be performed. If this be so, and the war that has been made upon me in consequence of advocating the Constitution and the Union is to result in my overthrow and in my destruction, and that flag—that glorious flag, the emblem of the Union, which was borne by Washington through a seven-years struggle—is interred, I want no more honorable winding-sheet than that brave old flag, and no more glorious grave than to be interred in the tomb of the Union.

And so, with undaunted courage, he made his choice.

In 1862, Lincoln made him military governor of Tennessee, charged with the duty of restoring in the State a civil government loyal to the United States. Fulfilling this difficult and dangerous duty with fidelity and a measure of success, he was, in 1864, selected by Lincoln as his running mate in the presidential campaign of that year, a choice dictated by a desire to show the outside world, by the selection of a Southerner, that the seceded States were still part of the Union, and a desire to express to the country, by the nomination of a Democrat, the reality

of the name Union Party, which the Republicans now assumed. It is not at all improbable that a third reason influenced Lincoln. The problem of the restoration of the seceded States was known to him to be of the first magnitude. Is it not likely that Johnson's known agreement¹ with his views and connection as military governor with his plan, may have been a leading cause of his decision?

This was the man, then, on whom devolved the duty and responsibility of restoring the seceded States, of carrying out Lincoln's plan, which was in all essential respects in accord with all his own political ideals and constitutional principles. For Johnson came out of the war as he went in—a States' Rights Democrat and, as such, a firm believer in the indestructibility of a State, a doctrine, which, although with stammering lips, he had clearly enunciated in his ever-to-be-regretted inaugural as Vice President.² In 1861, he had introduced into the Senate the following resolution, which was adopted almost unanimously, and which, in a slightly different form, the House had already adopted a few days before:³

That this war is not waged on our part in any spirit of oppression, nor for any purpose of subjugation, nor purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired.

The indestructibility of the Union and of a State was thus the doctrine on which the war was fought. It was the only solution in the Northern mind at the beginning of the war. It was the doctrine on which Lincoln's policy of war and policy of restoration were both based, it was the direct inspiration of Lincoln's and Seward's letters and instructions to ministers abroad,⁴ it appeared clearly in Sherman's convention

¹Johnson in 1863 had warned Lincoln through a letter to Montgomery Blair to beware of the proposition of States relapsing into territories and held as such. McPherson, *History of Rebellion*, p. 199.

²The part alluded to is as follows: "Before I conclude this brief inaugural address, in the presence of this audience—and I, though a plebian boy, am authorized by the principle of the government under which I live to feel proudly conscious that I am a man, and grave dignitaries are but men—before the Supreme Court, the representatives of foreign Governments, Senators and people, I desire to proclaim that Tennessee, whose representative I have been, is free. She has bent the tyrant's rod, she has broken the yoke of slavery, and today she stands redeemed! She waited not for the exercise of power by Congress; it was her own act, and she is now as loyal, Mr. Attorney General, as is the State from which you come. It is the doctrine of the Federal Constitution that no State can go out of the Union; and moreover Congress cannot eject a State from the Union. Thank God, Tennessee has never been out of the Union! It is true the operations of her government were for a time interrupted; there was an interregnum; but she is still in the Union and I am her representative. This day she elects her Governor and Legislature, which will be convened on the first Monday of April, and again her Senators and Representatives will soon mingle with those of her sister States; and who shall gainsay it, for the Constitution requires that to every State shall be guaranteed a republican form of government."

³This resolution was adopted with two dissenting votes in the Senate and five in the House.

⁴The instructions to Mr. Charles Francis Adams in 1861 contained the following: "You will indulge in no expressions of harshness or disrespect or even impatience concerning the seceding States, their agents, or their people. But you will, on the contrary, all the while remember that those States are now, as they always heretofore have been, and notwithstanding their temporary self-delusion, they must always continue to be, equal and honored members of this Federal Union, and that their citizens throughout all political misunderstandings and alienations, still are and always must be our kindred and countrymen."

with Johnston, and it was the ideal of both Lincoln and Johnson, neither of whom ever departed from it in any essential particular.

Let us now glance at the views and plans of Lincoln as to restoration. In 1863, he issued his amnesty proclamation in which he prescribed an oath, the taking of which would restore to his personal and property rights any supporter of the Confederacy, with the exception of civil and diplomatic officers of the Confederacy, those who had left judicial positions or seats in Congress or the army and navy of the United States to assist the Confederacy; all Confederate officers above the rank of colonel in the army or lieutenant in the navy, and all who had maltreated prisoners of war. At the same time he announced that he would recognize as the government of any seceded State, except Virginia, where the Peirpoint government had already been established, and which had throughout the war two Senators in Congress, and for a time several Representatives, such organizations as might be set up by persons who had taken the oath, provided they should reach in number ten per cent of the voting population of the State. Already in 1862, at the same time that Johnson was appointed military governor of Tennessee, General Shepley was given a similar appointment for Louisiana. Under their direction, elections for Congress were held in such districts of the two States as were then under Union control, and in the 37th Congress, there were two Representatives from Louisiana and three from Tennessee. To this extent Congress still recognized the existence of the States. Under these new terms governments were established in Louisiana and Arkansas which received the recognition of the President but which were denied representation in both houses of Congress. With Virginia and Tennessee they formed a nucleus for later presidential action.

This policy failed to meet with the approval of a majority in Congress. Not only did the legislative branch, now growing very sensitive to encroachments of the executive, fail to recognize the validity of the governments thus established; it denied that the President had any authority to deal with the problem of Reconstruction, and, to make its own position clear, passed an act providing for restoration on a pattern of its own. This act was "pocketed" by Lincoln, who made it the occasion for a most remarkable address to the people of the United States, which was in effect a veto message. This left him, as it were, in possession of the field, for a furious public attack made on him by Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio, and Henry Winter Davis, of Maryland, the leaders of the counter-movement in the Senate and the House, weakened him not at all, but had rather the opposite effect. In 1864, he was renominated with Johnson as his fellow-candidate who, as has been seen, was

in entire accord with his views, and on a platform which contained no plank opposed to their position. The strength of the ticket was sufficient to force the withdrawal of Fremont, who had been nominated by the radical opponents of the President. Nevertheless, it is not doubtful that had Lincoln lived, the contest would have been renewed, and that it would have taxed even his abilities to carry out his policy. But at the time the opposition was apparently stifled, for Congress, realizing fully that the end of the war was at hand, had adjourned until the following December, which, of course, gave the President a free hand. And Lincoln's views were known to be unchanged. To illustrate his eagerness upon the subject of a speedy restoration, his remarks to Johnson when the latter came to Washington to be inaugurated are interesting: "My great and sole desire has been to preserve these States intact under the Constitution as they were before; and there should be an amendment to the Constitution which would compel the States to send their Senators and Representatives to the Congress of the United States."¹

It was to this difficult position that Johnson now ascended, handicapped by his Democratic affiliations and sympathies, by his Southern birth, and by his temperamental characteristics. His coming, indeed, was hailed by the advanced radicals who distrusted Lincoln because they hated that quality of mercy which in him was indeed not strained. At the last meeting of the Cabinet, the latter had made clear his feeling in these words: "No one need expect I will take any part in hanging or killing these men. Frighten them out of the country, open the gates, let down the bars, scare them off. Enough lives have been sacrificed; we must extinguish our resentment if we expect harmony and Union."² But Johnson had a different record. Continually throughout the war, he had voiced his stern conviction that treason must be made odious by the hanging of traitors, a punishment which indeed he made it clear that he regarded as all too light for the offense. In his horror at Lincoln's assassination he had accepted, rather reluctantly it is true, but without serious question, Stanton's assurance that Joseph Holt had evidence to prove clearly the complicity of Jefferson Davis and other Southern leaders in the plot, and his fury, rekindled, caused violence of speech. On the very afternoon of Lincoln's death, a caucus of the more bitter Radicals was held at which the feeling "was nearly unanimous that the accession of Johnson would prove a God-send to the country." The next day, "Blunt Ben" Wade, speaking for the Committee on the Conduct of the War, of which Johnson had been an active and respected member, said: "Johnson, we have faith in you. By the gods, there will be no trouble now in running the government."³

¹Speech of Johnson, February 22, 1866.

²DeWitt, *Vice President Andrew Johnson*, in Southern History Association Publications, Vol. IX, No. 3, p. 159.

³Julian, *Recollections*, p. 257.

But Johnson, while severe, was not merciless, and time, responsibility, and a sincere desire for a genuine restoration of the Union greatly softened his views. Never had he favored widespread punishment, but he had always believed that leniency, conciliation, and amnesty should be extended to the mass of the people of the South. Another fact may be noticed. Most of Johnson's threats of punishment had been made while he was military governor of Tennessee or while he believed on the basis of the false statements of Stanton and Holt that Lincoln's death was the result of a Southern conspiracy participated in by Southern leaders. When he became President, with the actual control of affairs in his own hands, conditions were more powerful than theory, particularly when he discovered the falsehoods with which he had been imposed upon.

Another serious question of policy remained in doubt, namely, the status and treatment of the emancipated negroes. It was one of Johnson's best characteristics that he was able to listen attentively to advice, even when unwelcome, and afterwards to consider it with care and, for so intense a person as he, with quite an open mind. His very tact as a listener frequently brought him trouble as when Charles Sumner and Chief Justice Chase, confirmed negrophiles, both far in advance of public sentiment at the North, took his silence in response to their arguments for consent and declared him definitely committed to negro suffrage. But such was not at all the case. Johnson personally did not favor negro suffrage, although he would not have been opposed to a qualified form of it.¹ But far more important than his personal feeling in the matter was his absolute conviction that suffrage under the Constitution was a matter outside the province of the general government, and one to be regulated by the individual States alone.

When the question of restoration came before the Cabinet at its first meeting under the new administration on April 16, there was no necessity for any new theory or new plan. The plan applied in Tennessee, Virginia, Arkansas, and Louisiana was in operation, and Secretary Stanton had already, at the last meeting before Lincoln's death, submitted the draft of a proclamation for beginning the work in the other States. And so Johnson took up the work at the very place that Lincoln had left it.² The movement for assembling the Southern Legislature was checked. On May 9, the Peirpoint government of Virginia was

¹Cf. Johnson's letter to Governor Sharkey of Mississippi, McPherson, *Political Manual for 1866*, p. 19. In his conversation with George L. Stearns in October, 1865, he developed this idea more fully. Said he, "the elective franchise is not a natural right but a political one. I am not disposed on that point to interfere with the people of a State; if the people there go wrong we have the army and can control by legislation too. But the general government has no right of voting in the State. My position here is different from what it would be were I in Tennessee. There I would try to introduce negro suffrage gradually: (1) to those who had served in the army; (2) to those who could read and write; and perhaps (3) with a property qualification to others—say \$200 or \$250. It will not do to let the negroes have universal suffrage now; it would breed a war of races."

²Dunning, *Reconstruction, Social and Political*, p. 35.

recognized by formal proclamation, and without proclamation, the governments of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee were accepted. But when the plan for North Carolina was taken up, new problems were presented, since in that State there existed no nucleus of a loyal government. Either the old government had to be recognized or a new one set up. The establishment of a new one seemed the only possible solution and, as it was evident that the plan applied here would serve as a model for all, the draft prepared by Stanton was the object of the careful scrutiny of all the Cabinet. In it was found a clause which Stanton had allowed Sumner and Colfax to insert, providing that "loyal citizens of the United States, resident in the State" should elect members of a convention. Stanton, after being questioned by Welles, who had reason to suspect the trick, admitted that its purpose was to force negro suffrage. At his request, the Cabinet then voted on the subject without debate and divided equally, Seward being absent.¹ The President made no comment and retained the draft.

On May 24 Johnson laid before the Cabinet his own plan,² as contained in two proclamations. The first was a new amnesty offer, which was more severe than Lincoln's, in that there were six additional classes excluded from its benefits, the most noteworthy being that of persons worth twenty thousand dollars. But it was announced that any person belonging to an excepted class might make special application for pardon and a promise of a liberal exercise of executive clemency was made. The second was a proclamation, based upon the constitutional obligation of the United States to guarantee a republican form of government to the several States. This, after reciting that the war had deprived the State of North Carolina of civil government, appointed William W. Holden provisional governor, and directed him to prescribe rules for calling a convention of the people to be chosen by such persons as were loyal to the United States, and who were entitled to vote under the laws in force at the time of secession. The various heads of departments of the United States Government were then instructed to resume the performance of their duties within the State, and the courts were also instructed to resume the administration of justice.

It will be noticed that the President ignored the Radical demand for negro suffrage. Leaving out of consideration his constitutional views and personal preferences already alluded to, it must be said that, had he heeded it, he would have been far in advance of Northern public sentiment at this time. The demand for it was small. Only six States now granted it in any form, and two of those with restrictions,³ and there

¹Welles, *Diary*, II, pp. 301-02; *Galaxy*, April and May, 1872, pp. 526-37, 666. The vote stood as follows: For negro suffrage, Stanton, Dennison, and Speed; against, Welles, McCulloch, and Usher.

²The plan differed in no essential particular from that presented by Stanton except that part of it relating to the suffrage requirement.

³The five New England States and New York. New York and Connecticut imposed limitations upon negro suffrage.

was small likelihood of the number's being largely increased. Such men as Governor Morton, Governor Andrew, William Cullen Bryant, E. L. Godkin, Charles A. Dana, John Sherman, General Sherman, and J. W. Forney opposed it, as did such influential newspapers as the *New York Times*, the *Chicago Republican*, and the *Philadelphia Press*.

To the President's plan every member of the Cabinet assented, including Stanton,¹ and on May 29 both proclamations were issued. On June 13, a similar proclamation was issued in the case of Mississippi, and within a month, others for Georgia, Texas, Alabama, South Carolina, and Florida. Thus in less than two months the plan was put into practical operation in all the late Confederate States.

The provisional governors went promptly to work, and during the summer and fall of 1865 civil government was revived in each lately seceded State, except Texas, by the calling of a convention which carried out Johnson's plan in accordance with the proclamation and an important part of the plan not therein included. Through conversations and correspondence he had made it clear that he expected each State through its convention to declare the ordinance of secession null and void, abolish slavery, and repudiate its war debt. Further, the proposed Thirteenth Amendment was to be ratified as soon as the Legislature assembled. These conditions were, generally speaking, carried out in full.² Elections were held, the newly elected officers were installed, and when Congress met in December, 1865, every Southern State except Texas had full delegations present claiming seats in the two houses. There was evidently no need of Lincoln's constitutional amendment.

It must be confessed that the Southern people, while undoubtedly acting in entire sincerity and with the best intentions, displayed in their choice of Senators and members of Congress little political wisdom and small comprehension of the state of Northern sentiment. Scarcely one of those chosen could take the test oath, an indispensable requirement for admission. It is, however, very true, that every State would have found it difficult to send fit men who could take the oath. None could have sent representative men. Many of them had been very prominent in the war, and among the newly elected Southerners were Alexander H. Stephens, Vice-President of the Confederacy, William A. Graham, president *pro tem.* of the Confederate Senate, and Herschel V. Johnson, a Confederate Senator. Almost every one had served the Confederacy in some capacity. It can scarcely be a cause for wonder that the North found objections.

¹*Impeachment Testimony*, 1867, p. 401.

²South Carolina and Georgia repealed and Florida nullified the ordinances, while Mississippi refused to ratify the amendment.

In the meantime the amnesty oath prescribed by the President had been widely taken and thousands of applications for the pardon of excepted individuals had been made. Only a very small class in any State refrained from accepting the amnesty or seeking pardon. The South, up to this time, had not liked Johnson, but, generally speaking, it respected him, if only for his undoubted personal courage. His offer seemed and was to a high degree magnanimous and, while the exceptions to the benefits of the amnesty caused a wide exclusion, it was soon apparent that his promise of liberality in executive clemency was not an idle one. The example of sincere acceptance of the results of the war was set by General Lee and a host of other loved and trusted leaders who not only promptly applied for pardon but quietly and without presumption encouraged every movement and tendency towards sincere reconciliation. Their example was followed, and the South as a whole gave Johnson whole-hearted support and, with entire sincerity, accepted the apparent results of the war. "But," as Schouler says, "though willing enough to take back seats if readmitted to Congress, they bore their defeat at arms like men and would not avow more penitence than they really felt. They did not go upon their knees for mercy like abjects, but had been willing to face punishment. Glad to be at peace now with their conquerors, they would not confess themselves 'traitors,' in the odious sense of the word, nor 'criminals' because of what they had fought for."¹ And the President, recognizing the spirit with which his offers were met, was not chary of pardon. Even Rhodes, always contemptuous of Johnson, and nearly everywhere else bitterly unjust to him, says, "The President granted pardons freely and wisely."²

As yet it is undeniable that mistakes were made in the exercise of the pardoning power, though Johnson cannot justly be held responsible for them unless, in that the provisional governors were his creatures, their faults should be laid at his door. Many good Union men were kept from pardon while extreme secessionists received theirs. For example, William A. Graham, was kept from pardon for a long time by Governor Holden, while others far less deserving were recommended and pardoned. Another weakness in the system was caused by the number of applications and the various channels through which the President might be approached. Pardon matters usually went through the attorney-general's office, and Attorney-General James Speed had a cousin who was a pardon broker.³ That there were other similar abuses is more probable.

In the South, the element dominant in carrying out Johnson's policy

¹Schouler, *History of the Reconstruction Period*, p. 33.

²Rhodes, *History of the United States*, V, p. 535.

³R. J. Powell to W. W. Holden, North Carolina Executive Correspondence.

were the old Whigs, chiefly those of former strong Union proclivities. Democrats in general took a back seat. Extreme secessionists, of whatever political affiliations, did likewise. Not all the Southern people, however, were pleased with the policy. In every State there were those who ardently desired to see political opponents proscribed and persecuted, whose very Unionism was chiefly a hatred of secessionists.¹ But in every State, they formed but a small minority. Later, disappointed politicians who had at first warmly espoused Johnson's policy and Johnson's cause, were to organize against him and go over to the Radicals, but as yet there was no appearance of this.

Of the sincerity of the South there can be but little question. Newspaper reporters, bent on manufacturing Radical sentiment, did accept isolated expressions of violent opinion as indicative of the prevailing sentiment of the Southern people. Northern travelers, in all good faith were surprised and horrified beyond measure to find in the South no general consciousness and confession of guilt and no hilarious joy at defeat. Carl Schurz, a foreigner and a Radical, was able, as he wrote his wife,² to verify every preconceived opinion as to the insincerity of the Southern professions, to prove conclusively to his own satisfaction and that of other Radicals, that the negro must be protected and given the ballot, and to show beyond peradventure or dispute why harsh terms should be demanded. But that was what he went for. Many, however, far better qualified to judge than he, and with no preconception and predilections, found a very different situation of affairs. Passing over the findings of Watterson and Truman with the mere mention of them, let us take the opinion of General Grant, who nearly always spoke with sincerity and without bias when he had no interest at stake. Said he:

Both in traveling and while stopping, I saw much and conversed freely with the citizens of those States as well as with officers of the army who have been among them. The following are the conclusions come to by me:

I am satisfied that the mass of thinking men of the South accept the present situation of affairs in good faith. The questions which have hitherto divided the sentiments of the people of the two sections—slavery and State rights, or the right of a State to secede from the Union—they regard as having been settled forever by the highest tribunal (arms) that man can resort to. I was pleased to learn from the leading men whom I met that they not only accepted the decision arrived at as final, but that now the smoke of battle has cleared away and time has been given for reflection, that this decision has been a fortunate one for the whole country, they receiving the like benefits from it with those who opposed them in the field and in the cause. * * *

¹Andrews, *The South Since the War*, pp. 111-112, 391-92.

²*The Writings of Carl Schurz*, I, p. 268.

My observations lead me to the conclusion that the citizens of the Southern States are anxious to return to self-government within the Union as soon as possible; that while reconstructing they want and require protection from the Government; that they are in earnest in wishing to do what they think is required by the Government, not humiliating to them as citizens, and that if such a course was pointed out to them they would pursue it in good faith.

In the North apparently the policy met with hearty approval. Every state convention, Republican and Democratic, in the autumn of 1865, with the exception of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, where Stevens and Sumner were in full control, voiced this sentiment, and in those excepted cases Johnson was not condemned. Morton and Andrew, the war governors of Indiana and Massachusetts, gave the President their hearty support, as did, among others, Henry Ward Beecher. Among those who wrote him pledging support were Hannibal Hamlin, General John A. Dix, General Thomas, E. W. Washburn, Lyman Trumbull, Governor Curtin, Simon Cameron, Reverdy Johnson, Gratz Brown, Senators Dixon, Cowan, and Doolittle, Jeremiah S. Black, George Bancroft, Francis Lieber, and General William T. Sherman. The last mentioned wrote to his brother in November: "You observe Mr. Johnson is drifting towards my terms with Johnston. He cannot help it, for there is no other solution. Any plan will have objections, but that least of all."¹ The New York *Evening Post* said: "The President is already proving himself by his successive acts one of the most discreet, clear-sighted, upright, and capable statesmen of the age,"² while the *Nation* commented on the fact that his policy had "the miraculous property of appearing to satisfy all parts and parties of the country."³ Later the same paper declared the President's plan to be "the highest example of humanity, self-restraint, and sagacity ever witnessed—something to which the history of no other country offers any approach."⁴ And, finally, the larger number of the governors' messages in December and January gave the policy hearty approval. John Sherman, at a much later date, wrote: "After this long lapse of time I am convinced that Mr. Johnson's scheme of reorganization was wise and judicious. It was unfortunate that it had not the sanction of Congress,"⁵ and even Rhodes, with all his hostile bias, cannot but say: "If his plan had been sanctioned by the Republican majority it would have undoubtedly worked out pretty well the problem of Reconstruction."⁶

If it is asked why this "era of good feeling" did not continue, the answer is simple. The Radicals who had threatened Lincoln's policy

¹*The Sherman Letters*, p. 257.

²Issue of June 20, 1865.

³Issue of September 28, 1865.

⁴Issue of December 14, 1865.

⁵*Recollections*, p. 308.

⁶*Op. cit.*, V, p. 548.

liked Johnson's no better. In addition they regarded him as a traitor to their party and at once began to plot for his removal. The arch-enemies of the President and his policy, as well as of peace and reconciliation, were Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner, who, working from different points of view and with different motives, reached almost identical conclusions of practice, if not of theory, and formed a coalition upon which rests the responsibility for what we call Reconstruction. Stevens, the abler and more influential of the two, was a practical politician who looked at every question from the angle of party expediency and who strove for Republican success above all other ends. Calculating, selfish, unscrupulous, and imbued with an undying hatred for the South, he sought to inflict upon it the harsh punishment that his vindictive nature suggested. Lacking any repulsion in respect to the negro he advocated entire equality and practiced it. Sumner, on the other hand, was a theorist of the icy, idealistic, impractical sort, who made a fetish of human rights and equality and ended by worshipping an imaginary being which he called the negro, for whose actual embodiment, by the way, he entertained an instinctive and almost unconquerable physical disgust. Lacking sensibilities of any sort, he was incapable of passion, or, indeed, of any real emotions. He lived in abstractions and to secure what he theoretically regarded as justice was willing to inflict almost any concrete wrong. This unusual pair, whose joint activities were of a sort to betray even a cool-headed investigator of today into the verbal excesses characteristic of the fire-eaters of another generation, were the leaders in framing and directing congressional Reconstruction and as parties defendant they must answer the grave indictment which history will bring—which it has already brought—against them.

It is needless to say that the President's policy met with no favor from these men or their followers. Stevens called his entire course "insane," and Sumner defined his exclusion of negro suffrage from the North Carolina plan as "madness."¹ Stevens thought that, if something were not done, the President would be crowned king before Congress met, and continued, "The danger is that so much success will reconcile the people to almost anything."² The Radicals generally were dispirited and were determined to delay in the hope that some change in public sentiment favorable to their hopes might occur.

When Congress met the President won fresh assurance of approval because of his message, which was an unusually able document. Written as we now know by George Bancroft,³ it was, nevertheless, a faithful

¹Pierce, *Sumner*, IV, p. 253.

²Sumner, *Works*, p. 450.

³Dunning in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings*, Vol. XIX, p. 395.

expression of the President's views. The statement of his constitutional view of the status of the Southern States is worth quotation here:

States, within the proper limitations of power, are essential to the existence of the Constitution of the United States.

The perpetuity of the Constitution brings with it the perpetuity of the States, their mutual relations make us what we are, and in our political system this connection is indissoluble. The whole cannot exist without the parts or the parts without the whole. So long as the Constitution of the United States endures the States will endure; the destruction of the one is the destruction of the other; the preservation of the one is the preservation of the other.

The true theory is that all pretended acts of secession were from the beginning null and void. The States cannot commit treason nor screen the individual citizens who have committed treason any more than they can make valid treaties or engage in lawful commerce with any foreign power. The States attempting to secede placed themselves in a condition where their vitality was impaired, but not extinguished; their functions suspended, but not destroyed.

It contained further a statement of the progress of his plan, calling attention to the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment by the Southern States as "a pledge of perpetual loyalty and peace" and then said:

The amendment to the Constitution being adopted, it would remain for the States, whose powers have been so long in abeyance, to resume their places in the two branches of the National Legislature, and thereby complete the work of restoration. Here it is for you, fellow-citizens of the Senate, and for you, fellow-citizens of the House of Representatives, to judge, each of you for yourselves, of the elections, returns, and qualifications of your own members.

In spite of the general approval of the message, the extreme Radicals were not influenced. Before the reading of the message, they had already secured the exclusion of the Southern members and the appointment of the famous joint committee of fifteen on Reconstruction.

It is no part of this paper to discuss the relations of President Johnson with Congress and the final breach between them. This is a well known part of our history. Johnson's plan was complete; his further work was a vain, at times blundering and tactless, but an always honest and sincere attempt to check what he believed to a complete subversion of the Constitution. The following remarkable extract from one of his veto messages¹ indicates to what lengths he went in his appeals:

Those who advocated the right of secession alleged to their own justification that we had no regard for law, and that their rights of property, life, and liberty would not be safe under the Constitution as administered by us. If we now verify their assertion, we prove that they were in truth and in

¹Veto of the Reconstruction Bill, March 2, 1867. McPherson, *Political Manual* for 1867, pp. 45-46.

fact fighting for their liberty, and instead of branding their leaders with the dishonoring names of traitors against a righteous and legal government we elevate them in history to the rank of self-sacrificing patriots, consecrate them to the admiration of the world, and place them by the side of Washington, Hampden, and Sydney.

The hostility of the Radicals steadily increased and they finally succeeded in controlling the Republican party. The President standing in their way, they first by statute robbed him of important constitutional prerogatives and then resolved to displace him, chiefly for the reason set out in one of the minority reports of the Judiciary Committee on the question of his impeachment. It was as follows:

His greatest offense, we apprehend, will be found to be that he has not been able or willing to follow those who elected him to his office in their mad assaults upon and departure from the constitutional government of the fathers of the Republic; and that, standing where most of his party professed to stand when they elevated him to his present exalted position, he has dared to differ from a majority of Congress upon great and vital questions. He has believed in the continuing and binding obligations of the Constitution; that the suppression of the rebellion against the Union was the preservation of the Union and the States comprising it, and that when the rebellion was put down the States were all and equally entitled to representation in the Congress of the United States.

Slandered at every turn, watched in his official relations, his private life overlooked by spies, and his whole past raked up, the conspirators were unable to find any fact upon which to base charges against him. When finally impeached, the charges were so flimsy as to fall down completely before even such a court as the Senate of the United States had then sunk to be. And in the face of the facts¹ there are those today who, exercising the high calling of writing history, still perpetuate the slanders of those evil days and stamp him as an habitual drunkard!²

During this period he was by the Radicals thrown into the arms of the Democratic party, and with him went the white South, in time to be the Solid South. Had Johnson's plan prevailed, the phrase would never have been coined. And yet Johnson had not, as we have seen, made what Rhodes calls, "a political somersault."³ On the question of the punishment of the Southern leaders by judicial process he had a more consistent record than the Radicals themselves, although he refused to indict a whole people. On the question of Reconstruction he had simply followed the course to which he had always been openly and solemnly committed. Before the final breach every possible argument was employed and every kind of pressure was brought to bear to induce

¹McCulloch, *Men and Measures of Half a Century*, 373-74; *Century Magazine*, January, 1913, p. 438; *Impeachment Testimony*, 1867.

²Rhodes, *Op. cit.*, V, p. 520; Bassett, *History of the United States*, pp. 599, 611.

³*Op. cit.*, V., pp. 522-23.

him to modify his views in accordance with the change that had taken place in Republican sentiment, and to stay in the party. Nor were promises alone employed. When they failed, threats replaced them, only to meet with the same fate. When Browning, a member of his Cabinet, pressed him to some action as likely to check the movement for impeachment, Johnson replied impatiently: "I will do nothing to check impeachment, if there is any wish to press it. I am tired of hearing allusions to impeachment. God Almighty knows I will not turn aside from my public duties to attend to these contemptible assaults which are gotten up to embarrass the Administration."¹ He might have won great fame and popular applause as well as the continued support of the Radicals by yielding. The South undoubtedly might have escaped with easier terms than those ultimately demanded and enforced. But Johnson's policy was not shaped by affection or consideration for the South, although in time he came to feel for the Southern people a keen sympathy, but by devotion to the Union; his views were not based upon party doctrines or expediency, but upon constitutional principles, and, right or wrong, when once he reached a decision on that to him most sacred of subjects, the Constitution, it was final and there was no possibility of change nor shadow of turning.

It is to no mere partisan, then, no sectionalist, that Americans owe to Johnson their tribute of gratitude and of praise, but to a national defender of the Constitution who, while he failed, is today known to have been right, and who, by his course, set an example of courage, firmness, and official rectitude which must always mean much to loyal and clear-thinking men. They, more and more, as time passes, will come to see him in the light in which he was viewed by three members of his Cabinet, all of whom had also served with Lincoln. Hugh McCulloch said of him: "He was brave, honest, truthful. He never shrank from danger, disregarded an engagement, or was unfaithful to his pledges. His devotion to the Union was a passion. There was no sacrifice he would not make for it, no peril he would not encounter in its defense."² Seward said: "I confess, with a full sense of my accountability, that among all the public men with whom I have been associated or concerned, in this or any other country, no one has seemed to me to be more wholly free from personal caprice and selfish ambition than Andrew Johnson; none to be more purely and exclusively moved in public action by love of country and good-will to mankind."³ Still more noteworthy are the words of Welles who described him as "in many respects one of the best and most single-minded Executives we have ever had,"⁴ and

¹Welles, *Diary*, III, p. 52.

²*Op. cit.*, pp. 405-07.

³*Works*, 5, p. 523.

⁴*Diary*, III, p. 17.

"as pure, as honest, as patriotic a chief magistrate as we have ever had."¹ And Schouler, his most valiant defender of today, says with truth that when he retired from office he could challenge criticism in the language of Samuel, "Whose ox have I taken? Or whom have I defrauded? Whom have I oppressed? Or of whose hand have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith."²

I have implied that the South's chief debt to Johnson is the same as that owed by other sections of the country. And yet, we are so constituted, and properly, that we do not and cannot forget that, when the South was prostrate, it was he who, whatever ~~may~~ have been his reasons, extended a helping hand; that, when the people of the South were broken and all was lost save honor, it was he who, although he had himself suffered grievously at their hands, with magnanimity received them back into national fellowship, and, before the end of his term, extended a free pardon to all, including the well-nigh martyred Davis; that when the Southern States were excluded from a share in government, and when it was proposed in seriousness to hold them as conquered territory and deliver them over to the spoiler and the African, "that terrible inert mass of domesticated barbarism,"³ it was he who, undaunted, became the chief of their defenders; and finally, that when the Southern people were well-nigh desperate, his example restored their failing spirits and gave to them a fresh impulse to regain and hold the cherished gifts of the Fathers.

The time has come for Americans to see him as he was; to hold up his noble qualities for the admiration and emulation of the generations of coming Americans. Never was there a more fitting time to study them; for in him was no divided allegiance, his patriotism was unhyphenated, and for such as he the inspiring phrase, fast becoming a nation-wide motto, of our Southern-born President, the first since Andrew Johnson, was unnecessary. In his doctrine and in his life he exemplified

"America First."

•

¹*Diary*, p. 20.

²*Op. cit.*, p. 9.

³C. F. Adams, Jr., quoted in Rhodes, *Op. cit.*, VI, p. 82.

Thomas Jordan Jarvis and the Rebuilding of North Carolina

BY HENRY GROVES CONNOR.

George Bancroft, of Massachusetts, wrote of the early settlers of the Albemarle:

They were restless and turbulent in their imperfect submission to a government imposed on them from abroad; the administration of the colony was firm, humane, and tranquil when they were left to take care of themselves. Any government but one of their own institution was hard to be borne.

Unfortunately, two centuries later, the men of Massachusetts, and their descendants in other parts of the country, forgot the truth recorded by the eminent Massachusetts historian. To this fact, in a large measure, may be attributed conditions which existed in North Carolina from 1867 until 1877. The student of our State history, in the light of Bancroft's statement, will be able to understand and interpret the language found in the *Raleigh Observer* of January 2, 1877, commenting on the recent victory of the Conservative Party at the polls:

With feelings of the profoundest gratitude to Almighty God for the great deliverance He has vouchsafed to us, we chronicle the fact that North Carolinians once more live under a government administered by officers of their own free choosing.

This language gave expression to the convictions and emotions of a very large majority of the people of the State because it marked the day and the occasion when "the curtain fell upon the last scene of the great Reconstruction Drama." It is interesting to note, because it illustrates a law, the force of which neither the statesman who would legislate for, nor the student who would interpret the life of a people, can safely underestimate, the law of continuity and heredity. When, in 1876, the people of North Carolina determined to restore a government administered by men of their own choosing, they selected as their representatives and leaders, those who had inherited the spirit of the men of Albemarle, Mecklenburg and Cape Fear. Zebulon Baird Vance was of the Scotch-Irish stock of whom he said: "Resistance to tyranny, in all its forms, seemed to be their normal condition. It was a part of their religion." The ancestors of Thomas Jordan Jarvis were among the men of Albemarle, "who had been led to the choice of their residence from a hatred of restraint and had lost themselves among the woods in

search of independence." John M. Worth was a descendant of the liberty-loving, God-fearing Quakers, of Randolph. Thomas S. Kenan's ancestors had, prior to and during the Revolutionary period, been among the leaders of the Cape Fear, fighting for independence.

Eliminating mere political, partisan feeling, and viewing the past, in the historic spirit, it is difficult to understand how the men who dominated the counsels of the Federal government and formulated national legislation, half a century ago, were so ignorant of the history of this State, and the genius of its people, as to suppose that they could, except with rifles and bayonets, establish and maintain a government for them not of their own choosing. The student of our history is not surprised to find that the effort to do so resulted in a condition of which, at its conclusion, the President of the United States, referring to this and other Southern States, March 4, 1877, said:

The people are still impoverished, and the inestimable blessing of wise, honest, and peaceful local self-government is not fully enjoyed. Whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the cause of this condition of things, the fact is clear that in the progress of events the time has come when such government is the imperative necessity required by all the varied interests, public and private, of those States. But it must not be forgotten that only a local government which recognizes and maintains inviolate the rights of all is a true government. * * * The question which we have to consider for the immediate welfare of those States of the Union is the question of government or no government, of social order and all the peaceful industries and the happiness that belong to it, or a return to barbarism. It is a question in which every citizen of the Nation is deeply interested, and with respect to which we ought not to be, in a partisan sense, either Republicans or Democrats, but fellow-citizens and fellowmen to whom the interests of a common country and a common humanity are dear.

Students and writers of our history have, with striking agreement, fixed the year 1877, as the end of so-called "reconstruction" and the beginning of an era of growth and upbuilding of the Southern States, not upon new foundations, but upon a restoration to power and responsibility of those who represented all that was best of the "old order."

Mr. Bryce, discussing conditions following the Civil War, says:

The solution of these problems occupied twelve eventful years and constitutes one of the most intricate chapters in American history.

Following a narrative of the events of this period, he says:

The old principle of leaving the States to themselves gained more and more upon the popular mind. * * * The feeling, always strong in America, was that every community to which self-government has been granted must be left to itself to work out its own solution. * * * The end came in 1876-77.¹

¹*The American Commonwealth*, II, 479-80.

Mr. Rhodes, our latest and, in many respects, our best historian, when he reaches the year 1877, in his narrative, says:

With their resumption of home rule, the first step in the process by which intelligence and property gained the control of affairs in all of the Southern States that had joined the Confederacy, my history fitly ends.

Prof. Beard opens the first chapter of his "Contemporary American History," with the year 1877, and the title "The Restoration of White Dominion in the South."

In discharging the duty kindly imposed upon me by the State Literary and Historical Association of presenting, briefly, a study of the "Rebuilding of North Carolina," the relation borne to it, and the services rendered to the State, by Thomas Jordan Jarvis, I avoid the use of the language of partisan politics. I do not quote from the partisan literature of that period. It is not consistent with the purposes of the Association, to perpetuate sectional or racial enmities, or unnecessarily recall unhappy political events. In a representative democracy, as ours, it is, however, impossible to separate its social, industrial, educational and economic, from its political history. The conservation of law and order, the enactment of laws, the expression of its thoughts and its aspirations, are so intimately blended with the opinions and conduct of political leaders and political organizations, that reference to one is essential to an intelligent study of the other. It has been wisely said:

There is probably no better test of the political genius of a nation than the power which it possesses of adapting old institutions to new wants. * * * It is difficult to overestimate its importance. It is the institutions of a country that chiefly maintain its organic unity, its essential connection with the past. By their continuous existence they bind together, as by a living chain, the past with the present, the living with the dead.

It is, for the purpose of this paper, neither necessary nor appropriate, to enquire into the motives of the National Statesmen of 1867-77, but it would be impossible to understand the work of those who, in 1877, as leaders and exponents of the will of the people, began the work of rebuilding North Carolina, without reference to the conditions by which they were confronted, and with which they were called upon to deal. It is, for this purpose only, that we recall the description of these conditions, as we find them, not in the passionate rhetoric of political orators, or party organs, but in the well considered, sober words of those who spoke under a sense of authority and duty. The jury, which time empanels, has rendered its verdict upon the effort to build, in North Carolina, a new State, to create a new social and political fabric, to discard the genius, the spirit, the traditions and the aspirations of the fathers—and from this verdict, neither victor nor vanquished has ap-

pealed. The people of the State in November, 1876, by a large majority, called to the work of administering their government, Zebulon B. Vance, as Governor, Thomas J. Jarvis, as Lieutenant-Governor, Joseph A. Engelhard, as Secretary of State, John M. Worth, as Treasurer, Thomas S. Kenan, as Attorney-General, Samuel L. Love, as Auditor, and John C. Scarborough, as Superintendent of Public Instruction. The majority of the General Assembly and Judiciary was in accord with the views and purposes of the Executive Department.

It is not within the limits of this study to enter into details of existing conditions. In his Inaugural Address Governor Vance set forth, in vigorous language, the general conditions, and indicated clearly the spirit with which, and the ends for which, the new administration, interpreting the will of the people, would labor. He said:

In assuming once more the government of our native State, we are reminded that with power comes responsibility. The deep wounds of the last fifteen years of war and misgovernment have inflicted upon her wounds still unhealed. Our public credit has been swept away; our educational fund has been destroyed; so far as in us lies, it is our bounden duty to remedy these things—to restore our public credit, to promote the regaining of our wealth, to educate the children of the State, to mitigate sectional and race animosities. In an especial manner, it is our duty to disabuse the minds of our black citizens of the false impressions which unscrupulous demagogues have instilled into them that we intend in any way to interfere with their chartered rights.

No citizen understood more clearly, or interpreted more correctly, the spirit and purpose of the people of North Carolina, nor did any possess more fully their confidence and affection. He had led them through the dark and sad years of Civil War, and the darker and sadder days of defeat and "reconstruction," and he had, at all times, and in all things, been loyal to himself and to them. His associates, while younger, had served the State with equal loyalty in war and in peace and stood ready to unite with him in the great work to which they had been called—showing to the victorious and distrustful section that the people of North Carolina of 1877 had inherited the spirit of the men of 1677 and 1777—that, "When left to take care of themselves, their government would be firm, humane and tranquil," and that "Good laws are but the arrangement of men in society in their just and natural relation." It was for the establishment of this truth that for two hundred years North Carolinians had, at all times, contended, and to the final settlement of the issue in North Carolina, they consecrated their minds and their hearts, on January 1, 1877.

To understand the situation, it is necessary to recall the past. While the State was a Military Division, in command of General Canby, with

his headquarters at Charleston, S. C., and under orders issued by him, in accordance with the act of Congress, a Convention had been called and a Constitution framed and, under the same conditions, ratified by such of the people as were permitted, by military officers, to vote. This Constitution went into effect August 1, 1868. In many very important respects, it worked radical changes in the system of State government, which had prevailed since 1776. A Convention held during the year 1875, submitted amendments to the people restoring, so far as was practical, the old system of local government. These amendments were ratified by a very large majority of the voters at the election held November, 1876, and became effective January 1, 1877. In his message to the General Assembly, Governor Vance recommended the enactment of such legislation as was contemplated by and would effectuate the amendments. Among the evils which the Constitution of 1868 had fastened upon the people of many of the counties, was incompetent and corrupt municipal and county governments. This had resulted in the creation of an enormous county indebtedness, the destruction of credit, inefficient administration of the affairs of the counties and cities of the State, with the social and industrial condition always produced by such government. The Legislature promptly changed the system and provided for the inauguration of honest, intelligent and efficient county government. The Governor made a number of recommendations concerning the promotion of public education, which had been sadly neglected. He recommended the establishment of Normal Schools for training teachers, submitting a memorial of the Teachers' Assembly. He also submitted, with his endorsement, the memorial of the Patrons of Husbandry, an association of the farmers of the State for the establishment of a Department of Agriculture. He made recommendations in regard to the public debt, which had been increased to an enormous extent by the issue of bonds, fraudulent in their inception and creation, and, to a very large amount, in violation of express constitutional restrictions; and he recommended the reduction of expenses and inauguration of economy. The several departments of the State Administration began, with marked intelligence and patriotic zeal, the work of clearing away the obstructions to the welfare of the people and the adoption of plans for its promotion.

In accordance with the unanimous wish and purpose of the dominant party, Governor Vance was, at the Session of 1879, elected by the General Assembly, United States Senator and, on the 4th of March, 1879, he was succeeded as Governor by Thomas J. Jarvis, who had been, while Lieutenant-Governor and President of the State Senate, in close and harmonious sympathy with the plans and measures of Governor Vance. Before entering upon a narrative of the Administration of Governor

Jarvis, it will be well to recall the important events and incidents in his life.

We learn, from the admirable sketch of Captain Samuel A. Ashe, that, among those who, in its early settlement, made their homes in Albemarle was Thomas Jarvis, who bought from the Indians a tract of land on the neck between Perquimans River and the Carolina Sound. In 1691, he was appointed by Governor Ludwell, the Governor of both the Carolinas, Deputy Governor and for several years discharged the duties of Governor of the Province. Descended from him, through several generations, was Rev. Bannister H. Jarvis, a minister of the Methodist Church. His son, Thomas Jordan Jarvis, was born January 18, 1836, at Jarvisburg, Currituck County. Captain Ashe says:

His father's circumstances being straitened, the son did not enjoy the advantages of an early education; but after attending the county schools in boyhood, being determined to improve himself, when nineteen years of age he entered Randolph-Macon College (then located near Boyton, Virginia), and with money earned by teaching at intervals and through the assistance furnished by Mr. John Saunderson, he completed his course there in 1860, receiving the degree of A.M. On graduation he opened a school in Pasquotank County, where he was engaged in teaching in the spring of 1861 when the Civil War came on.

Like the large majority of the young men of the State, when the State seceded and Lincoln called for troops to coerce the other States, he promptly enlisted in the military service. By his courage, constancy and devotion to duty he soon secured promotion to the command of his Company in the Eighteenth North Carolina Regiment. He served in many of the battles in Virginia and North Carolina, displaying, at all times, a heroism, fortitude and endurance not surpassed by any of his comrades. At the battle of Drewry's Bluff, May, 1864, he was severely wounded in his right arm, which permanently disabled him for active duty. He was confined in the hospital when General Lee surrendered, and was paroled May, 1865.

Without means, and disabled by his shattered arm to perform manual labor, he procured credit and opened a small country store, in the meanwhile, beginning the study of law. He was elected, by the people of his native county, a delegate to the Convention, called in 1865, by President Johnson. Having obtained his license to practice his profession, June, 1867, he removed to Columbia, in Tyrrell County, and was elected a member of the General Assembly of 1868. In that body he acted with Major John W. Graham, Plato Durham, James L. Robinson and the few other Democratic members, in strenuous opposition to the financial and partisan measures of the majority. The Democrats having secured a majority in both Houses of the General Assembly of

1870, Captain Jarvis was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives. As such he became the chief director of legislation, and exerted a controlling influence on the destiny of the people of North Carolina. Later removing to Greenville, the county-seat of Pitt County, he devoted his attention to the practice of his profession, giving, however, at all times, his services to the people. He was a candidate for Elector on the Greeley ticket, 1872. He was a member of the Convention of 1875, and to his prudent management was chiefly due the power of the Democrats to organize and control that body, which was evenly divided between the two parties. As we have seen, he was elected Lieutenant-Governor and, succeeding Governor Vance, became Governor of the State, March 4, 1879.

The administration of Governor Vance, followed by Governor Jarvis, found that the public debt was far beyond the capacity of the State in her impoverished condition, to pay either principal or interest. Special tax bonds to the amount of \$16,246,550.10, issued by the Convention and Legislature of 1868, were outstanding for which the State had received but little benefit. A portion of them was declared by the Supreme Court to be invalid, and all of them were later repudiated as fraudulent and void. No interest had been paid upon the valid debt contracted for the construction of railroads prior to the Civil War. It was impossible for the State to take any step forward until some adjustment of this debt was made. To this essential undertaking, the administration and the Legislature gave prompt and earnest attention. The State University had been closed from 1868 until 1875 when, with the very limited means within the power of the State to extend aid, it was reopened. The stock which the State held in several railroads, constructed prior to the war, was sold and the proceeds wasted, or worse, by those in power during the reconstruction period. The stock owned by the State in the North Carolina Railroad Company had been sequestered by the Federal Court, was in the hands of a receiver and the road leased for a long period. Large sums had been expended and bonds were outstanding for the construction of the Western Railroad, but a large part of the bonds had been wasted or misappropriated, and the road was still unfinished.

Although the Democratic Party was committed to the completion of this great work of internal improvement, much opposition had arisen in the eastern section of the State to further expenditure of money, or issue of bonds, for that purpose. It became manifest that the cost of completion of the Western North Carolina Railroad, with the difficulties to be overcome in crossing the mountains, would impose a burden upon the tax payers which, in the then financial condition of the people, would

continue to create and intensify opposition. During the winter of 1879 Governor Jarvis received a proposition from certain Northern capitalists, to purchase the State's interest in the road and to complete its construction. After giving to the proposition careful consideration, with the advice of his counsel, he decided to call the General Assembly together in Special Session and submit the question to its members whether the sale should be made. To this end he issued his proclamation. On March 15, 1880, the members convened for the purpose indicated. The question of making the sale excited very great interest. Public opinion was divided and the opposing forces entered upon the discussion with intense interest and some feeling. The Governor, in his message, set forth clearly the condition with which the State was presented, together with a draft of the proposition which had been carefully considered and the State's interest safeguarded, by Messrs. George Davis and Thomas Ruffin, two of the most eminent citizens and lawyers of the State. The proposition was accepted by the General Assembly and, although the original contractors were unable to perform their obligations, others took up the work and it was completed.

Many years after the construction of the Western North Carolina Railroad was completed, and it had ceased to be a subject of discussion, Governor Jarvis set out in a letter his reasons for urging upon the Legislature the sale of the Western North Carolina Railroad. Giving an account of the policy which the State had pursued in contributing aid by issuing bonds, and appropriating money to the construction of railroads, and the necessity for continuing this policy unless the road was sold, he writes:

I knew that to sell it meant to reverse the State's policy, but this was just what I wanted to do. I wanted to divorce the State from her works of internal improvement and turn her energies in the direction of the development of her resources and in the education of the children. I determined on a policy of letting private capital and enterprise build the railroad, and then let the State take up those things which belonged more particularly to the function of government. When I determined to sell the Western Road I also determined to close, if possible, every avenue of failure. It was my desire and purpose to sell the property under conditions that would secure its completion and that would leave behind the sale a public sentiment which would uphold what I had done. I studied the situation. I called the board of directors of the road in session in Raleigh, and they advised me to spurn the offer and go on with the work of building. A number of strong men came out in violent opposition; many of the public men of the State were silent and waiting. I knew I had to fight them and many others of less force and influence, and still I was determined upon the policy of selling the road and reversing the policy of the State. My ever-source of wisdom and power was Col. William L. Saunders. I went over the whole situation with him. He and I concluded that two of the ablest, purest, most powerful and

most unselfish men in the State were George Davis, of Wilmington, and Thomas Ruffin, of Hillsboro. I telegraphed these two gentlemen to come to Raleigh. They promptly came.

He says that he explained to them the situation, that he wished the State to cease building railroads and go into the building of schoolhouses. After describing the service rendered by these gentlemen, for which they refused to accept any compensation, "not even the payment of their hotel bills," he says:

At the next regular session of the Legislature the State road from Fayetteville to Gulf was sold to a North Carolina syndicate, and this road was soon extended to Bennettsville, S. C., to Wilmington, N. C., and to Mount Airy via Greensboro. With the sale of the Western North Carolina Railroad the State's policy was completely reversed, and from that day the State has put no money in railroads, but has encouraged railroad building by individual capital and enterprise. Having taken the State out of railroad building I took up the work of building schoolhouses and making exhibitions of the State's resources and inviting capital into the State. That policy has since become the fixed policy of the State.

In his message to the Legislature he gives the report of the President of the road, with the estimated cost of its completion, saying:

The time required to build and equip these two lines (from Asheville to Paint Rock and to Ducktown) under existing laws he estimates to be thirty years; and this estimate supposes that every dollar of the annual appropriations be paid by the State and used for that purpose.

The wisdom of the course pursued by Governor Jarvis, in dealing with this great interest of the State, is not open to discussion. The road was completed; other roads to which the State was contributing aid have also been finished and many miles of new railroads built; public schoolhouses and other State institutions for carrying on the work of public education have been established, and are now contributing to the work of educating the children of the State.

Governor Jarvis was elected, at the November election of 1880, for a full term of four years, beginning January 1, 1881. In his Inaugural he discussed the conditions existing and outlined the policy which he would pursue, saying: "Were I to formulate them in one sentence, it would be 'North Carolina—the development of her resources, and the education of her children.'"

In his message to the General Assembly, referring to the work of settling the State debt, he says: "The persistent efforts of Dr. Worth, the State Treasurer, to get our State debt adjusted, has had its reward." Old bonds to a large amount had been redeemed and new bonds issued in settlement. Among other recommendations, he urged the erection of a new Supreme Court building which was provided for by the Legisla-

ture of 1885; the building of a Governor's Mansion, which he lived to see completed; the codification of the Statute law of the State, resulting in the Code of 1883, by a Commission composed of W. T. Dortch, John Manning and John S. Henderson. He successfully urged the enlarging of the work and promoting the efficiency of the Department of Agriculture. As an illustration of his foresight and his courage in assuming responsibility, he saw an opportunity for acquiring for the use of the Department, a building and location, and without legislative authority he contracted for the purchase of the property used for that purpose and upon which the Supreme Court Building was subsequently erected, and his action was ratified by the General Assembly at the next session. This property is of inestimable value to the State. The Western State Hospital at Morganton, and the Eastern Hospital for the colored insane at Goldsboro were built. Pressing upon the Legislature the duty of providing for and inviting immigration and promoting public education, Governor Jarvis said:

He who loves his State cannot reflect without a feeling of pain upon the fact that of the 32,005,000 acres, or thereabouts, within the borders of the State a little less than one-half lies unimproved. And the fact even more painful meets us in our survey of the State—the fact that so large a proportion of children of the State are growing up without the advantage of public education. In these facts lie the weakness of our Commonwealth, and to these it behooves us to direct our attention. No scheme for the advancement of North Carolina and the development of her resources can be successful or permanent which does not encompass the education of her children. This I regard as of the very first importance, for without it all of our efforts will be in vain. Capital, proverbially timid, will not look for investment in a land of ignorance, nor will emigrants seek homes where there are no school-houses and churches.

Governor Jarvis was deeply impressed with the duty of the State to provide for the welfare and promote the education of the colored people of the State. He regarded this as a duty which should not and could not, without imperiling the welfare of the State, be neglected. In his message of 1881, he said:

I regard it as an imperative duty, from which the whites cannot escape, to see that in all things full and exact justice is done the blacks, and that they are not left alone to work out their destiny. They are entitled by many binding considerations to receive aid and encouragement from the whites in their efforts to be better men and women, and I have no doubt will receive it.

He not only advocated generous and just treatment to them in all respects, but actively promoted every effort made for their welfare. After the election of 1898, when feeling was aroused against the negroes on account of the course pursued by them, as a race, and propositions

were advanced for so amending the Constitution that the public school taxes should be divided between the races in the proportion in which each race contributed, he wrote me, as a member of the Legislature, November 16, 1898:

While I am in favor of making it impossible for the negro to govern, I am not in favor of making a heathen of him to live in our midst. To say that no money shall be appropriated to negro schools except what the negro pays is practically to say that he shall have no schools, and that the negro children are to grow up as heathens in a so-called Christian land. I am opposed to any such policy * * * The matter is giving me no little concern.

In his message to the General Assembly of 1883, he discussed and recommended a number of measures for the promotion of all of the public interests. Foreseeing the necessity for, and wisdom of, providing a commission with power to adjust differences between the people and the railroads, he recommended the establishment of such a commission, saying:

There ought not to be any conflict between the railroads and the people. The true interests of both, when properly understood, in my opinion, go hand in hand.

During the closing year of Governor Jarvis's administration, an Exposition was held in Raleigh, remaining open during six weeks, exhibiting the remarkable progress which had been made in the agricultural, mechanical and industrial life of the people.

At the election of 1884 the people, by an unprecedented majority, expressed their approval of the administration of their State government. In his message to the General Assembly of 1885, referring to the conclusion of his service as Governor, being under the Constitution ineligible for reelection, Governor Jarvis said:

This is the last message it will ever be my privilege to communicate to the Legislature of the State, and I trust it will not be considered inappropriate for me to express to the people of North Carolina, through you, their representatives, the deep obligation I am under to them. By their will, I have for six consecutive years filled the highest office within their gifts. In all things I have tried to administer the great trust solely in their best interests.

The work of commuting and settling the debt had been successfully prosecuted. The credit of the State had been established. Under the wise and aggressive administration of Hon. J. C. Scarborough with the active and sympathetic coöperation of the Governor, the work of public education had made great progress. By reason of the amount paid into the State Treasury, on account of the sale of the Western North Carolina Railroad, and the economical administration of the State govern-

ment, the condition of the Treasury at the conclusion of the administration of Governor Jarvis, was more than satisfactory. The Treasurer's report showed a balance of \$947,068.56, of which \$926,086.98 was available for current expenses. Nearly ten million dollars of the valid bonded indebtedness had been compromised, for which \$2,803,796.25 new bonds had been issued. Peace and prosperity prevailed, the laws were administered, and justice, tempered by moderation, enforced by the Courts, the relations between the white and colored races were friendly, based upon mutual confidence. Dr. Kemp P. Battle, President of the State University, at the commencement of 1884, paid a high tribute to the fidelity of Governor Jarvis, as Chairman of the Board of Trustees, saying: "To him we owe more than any other man, our railroad, our Memorial Hall and pecuniary aid in times of desperate need." The Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon him as "an officer of enlightened views generally, and an especial advocate of higher education." Acting upon the recommendation of Governor Jarvis, and his successor, Governor Scales, the Legislature of 1885 voted the increased appropriation for the maintenance of the University asked for. It was impossible, during the eight years of the administrations of Governor Vance and Governor Jarvis to do more than remove many of the obstructions to the development of the State and its upbuilding, which four years of Civil War and ten years of mis-called reconstruction government had created, and to lay the foundations for rebuilding. That this was done with a broad vision of the future and ardent patriotism is demonstrated by the continued growth of the State, in "the development of her resources and the education of her children," the two principal objects for which, in his first Inaugural, the Governor pledged his best efforts.

Governor Jarvis was wise in the selection of those whom he called to his aid in the administration of the affairs of the State. A large majority of those who, in both public and private station, served wisely and well in the upbuilding of the State and promotion of the welfare of the people, during those years, have passed away. Some survived to share with him the joy which comes from successful service. In the mutation of the State's life and progress, the conflicts of personal and political interests, justice has not always been done them and their work. In a democracy, with its freedom of thought and speech, the criticism of men and measures essential to growth and security of the larger things, this is the fate of all men who serve the State. Those who do so with courage and fidelity must, at times, withstand the people, and submit to criticism, sometimes ignorantly and, at other times, unjustly, being content to await the vindication of their motives and conduct which always

comes with larger light and clearer vision. As said by Governor Vance, in the opening sentence of his Inaugural, smarting under the wrongs which had been done to the people of the State: "There is retribution in history," there is likewise final judgment—the sober second thought of the people which recognizes unselfish, wise and patriotic public service, courageously performed. The motives and conduct of these men will be better known, and, with larger knowledge, will come just judgment and generous appreciation.

No man understood this, or with more confidence and stronger assurance of the ultimate vindication of his work, was more content to wait, than Thomas J. Jarvis. He left the Executive office January 1, 1885, after eight years of service, with no more material wealth than when he enlisted in the army of the State as a soldier in 1861. Recognizing his capacity for service and his wisdom in dealing with men and affairs, President Cleveland tendered to Governor Jarvis the position of Ambassador to Brazil. This position he filled for four years, with entire satisfaction to both governments. Upon his return to North Carolina, although well advanced in life, after twelve years withdrawn from the study of the law, he resumed the practice of his profession and by industry and diligent study of the Reports of the Supreme Court and the statute law, he became a well informed, successful lawyer. Upon the death of Senator Vance, April, 1894, he was tendered by Governor Carr, the appointment of United States Senator. Together with Senator Ransom he represented the State, in the Senate, until March 4, 1895. The opposition parties having a majority in the Legislature, he was not a candidate for election. His short term of service was during the stormy days of Mr. Cleveland's second administration, when the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill and the silver question were disrupting the Democratic party and the discontent incident to the depression in the agricultural interests of the South, produced a political revolution. Governor Jarvis, with many of those who had engaged in the work of rescuing the State from the evils of reconstruction, retired from official life. For the last twenty years of his life, although neither seeking nor holding office, he continued as a private citizen to enjoy in ever increasing measure, the confidence and esteem of the people. He was deeply interested in and never failed in every way in his power to contribute to the promotion of their highest interests. He took part in the discussion of questions in which the people were interested, especially those pertaining to the advancement of the cause of public education. In the prohibition campaign he made a number of strong, convincing and practical addresses. He was frequently called into the councils of his party, presiding over

its Conventions and in all ways contributing to the promotion of its measures and policies.

Capt. Samuel A. Ashe, the best informed citizen of the State regarding the men and events of those years, speaking in the light of the present, says:

I was entirely conversant with the State's affairs during Governor Jarvis' administration. No other Governor of the State has ever served the people more efficiently than he did. It was his fortune to be called to the administration when public sentiment and thought were in a formative state, and he pursued a bold policy of development and progress with intelligence, with boldness, with energy and rare ability, and with a sense of the responsibility of his high office. He had the opportunity and he used it. He was successful on every line, and the progress of the State in material and educational development while he was at the helm was beyond all expectation. His administration was the most brilliant in performance and the most satisfactory in results of any in the history of the State. He accomplished more for the general welfare in promoting educational advancement, increasing industrial facilities, and in establishing general prosperity, contentment and happiness in the homes of the people than it has been the good fortune of any other Governor to do.

Senator Overman, for a year his Private Secretary, writes:

I had not known Governor Jarvis except as a public man. I barely knew him personally when accepting the position with Governor Vance. I soon came to love him as a brother for his uniform kindness to me and to everybody, for his open-heartedness, his candor, his sincerity, and his kindly consideration for all men, great and humble alike. I admired him for his intense patriotism and love for his State and his people. I respected him for his great patience under the most trying circumstances. I admired him for his great wisdom, common sense, and the wonderful courage shown on all occasions in carrying out what he conceived to be the best interest of the people and the State. I have often seen him sitting in the executive office alone, meditating on matters of great importance to the State and those things which would promote the welfare of the people. The measures which he initiated and brought to a conclusion have been of lasting benefit to the State.

Referring to his determination, against opposition, to have the State represented at the Boston Exposition, Senator Overman says:

I doubt whether anything was done during that period of our history which did more to bring the State to the front. The display of our products there, and the reception given to him and his staff, opened the eyes of the people of New England as to the resources of North Carolina. It not only made the State respected abroad, but brought millions of dollars here for investment. * * * It was the controlling purpose of his administration to awaken an enthusiastic sentiment for the education of all the people, to promote industrial enterprises, to encourage railroad building, to provide for the enlargement of our charitable institutions, and to lift our people out of

their impoverished condition. With this intense patriotism and untiring energy and zeal, he initiated many of those measures which he lived to see ripen into a glorious reality.

The work to which he devoted the last years of his life, with the enthusiasm of youth, the mature judgment of middle life, and the affection of old age was the establishment and maintenance of the East Carolina Teachers' Training School at Greenville. This institution was the object of his love and labor. It was the realization of the visions of his young manhood and the culmination of his life work. To those who visited him in his home and accompanied him on a visit to that institution, without which he regarded the day as incomplete, it was a joy to witness his enthusiastic ardor and his all-absorbing affection. His wise counsel and words of encouragement to teachers and pupils were inspiring. He gave to its welfare freely of his thought, his time and service. He was permitted to see the accomplishment of the object which as Governor he declared to be the dominant purpose of his life—"the development of the resources, and the education of the children of North Carolina."

In laying the foundations upon which the broken fortunes of the people of North Carolina were to be restored, and their prosperity rebuilt, so many of those called into service performed their part so wisely that their memories will be held in sacred regard without comparison or rivalry of merit. Of Governor Jarvis it may be truly said that he was in his mental and moral characteristics, his standards of public and private life, peculiarly representative of the genius of the people of the State. He was, in no sense, a radical, nor was he, in the usual sense of the word, a reformer. He placed a correct estimate upon the value of the teachings and experiences of the past, he never sought to break away from them, or to build upon other foundations. He was intensely democratic in the largest sense of the term; he had as much confidence in the patriotism, virtue and ultimate wisdom of the people as Jefferson, and yet he recognized the truth that the efficiency and safety of a democracy lay in its representative character and the wisdom of its leaders. To him the law was the expression of the will of the people, speaking through and under the limitations of a written constitution. He was progressive in the adaptation of the lessons taught by experience, to the demands of new conditions and the promotion of the happiness and welfare of the people. In fundamentals he was always conservative. He was, in all things and at all times, optimistic as all men are whose lives are grounded in faith in God and man. His manner of life was simple and free from affectation. He recognized, in the growth of the State, the importance of and necessity for the develop-

ment and conservation of her material resources, the prosperity and financial credit of her people, regarding them as agencies for promoting physical comfort and welfare. He did not fail to recognize and enforce the primary truth that their real strength and permanent happiness were found not upon that which they had, but that which they were, that their fathers had laid the foundations of their character in being and not seeming to be; that material wealth counted for but little and lasted but for a day unless those who made or inherited it possessed personal integrity and practiced those virtues which illustrate and express patriotism, love of home, purity of life, justice, obedience to law and observed the sacred relationships of life. Recognizing the value of material, mental and political forces, in the growth of the State, he well knew that the foundation of the State must, if it is to be secure and lasting, "be laid in pure domestic life, in commercial integrity, in a high standard of moral worth and of public spirit; in simple habits, in courage, in uprightness and self sacrifice, in a certain soundness and moderation of judgment, which springs quite as much from character as from intellect." By precept and example he ever kept these truths to the forefront and impressed their primary importance upon the people.

He held, with unquestioning faith, to the belief that the Constitution of the Republic, while not perfect in its details, was the people's charter and their ark of safety. He belonged to the school of strict constructionists which holds, and teachers, that where civil and religious liberty, or the protection of personal rights are involved, the limitations upon power are to be sacredly observed, while in matters of administration the necessity for growth and development to meet new conditions must be recognized. He was, as Fiske says of Jefferson, a "Conservative Reformer." While in those things which made for the education and uplift of the people, he was an optimistic enthusiast, he was never a theorist or doctrinaire. The cast of his mind was practical in its method of dealing with and working out plans and problems of government. He wrought for results by methods consistent with and conservative of principles.

He held, with unswerving fidelity and integrity to the religious faith of his fathers. For many years he was a consistent, active member of the Methodist Church, giving of his means liberally and of his time and wisdom, without measure. He was frequently a member of the councils of the church, local and general.

Governor Jarvis was, in December, 1874, happily married to Miss Mary Woodson, daughter of Judge John Woodson, of Virginia. On June 17, 1915, in the eightieth year of his earthly life, he fell upon sleep and rested from the labors of his long, honorable and useful life.

The people of the State, without regard to race, party, or creed, gave prompt and sincere expression to their appreciation of his service, his example, and of their affectionate esteem. In his will, giving to his wife, to whom he referred as "my constant companion and chief object of my affection" his entire estate, he says: "Intelligence and virtue mark the standing of any people in the State and nation, and I would therefore urge the people to press the education of their children far beyond anything heretofore attempted." That North Carolina has steadily advanced in all of those things which secure the educational, moral, social and material welfare of a modern American State—conservatively progressive and progressively conservative—holding fast, in essentials, to the teaching and example of the fathers, the adaptation of their best thought and reflection to the welfare of the sons, growing in population, wealth, education and the happiness of her people, is due in no small measure, to the patriotism and wisdom of the men of 1876, and of these, Thomas Jordan Jarvis stood in the forefront.

North Carolina Bibliography, 1915

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

ALBERTSON, Catherine Seyton (Elizabeth City, N. C.).

In ancient Albemarle; published by the N. C. Society Daughters of the Revolution; illustrated from drawings by Mabel Pugh. D. 170 p. Commercial Printing Co. (Dec.) 1914. \$1.25.

BAILEY, Waldron. In the heart of the Blue Ridge.

BRIGGS, Thomas Henry (Professor at Columbia University).

Formal English grammar as a discipline. (*Teachers College Record*, Vol. 14, No. 4.) O. 93 p. il. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913. Pap. 30 cents.

Laboratory manual of letters. S. 94 p. Ginn, 1914, 25 cents.

COON, Charles L. (Superintendent of schools, Wilson, N. C.)

North Carolina schools and academies, 1790-1840; a documentary history. O. 846 p. Edwards & Broughton, 1915. Gratis. (Publications of the N. C. Historical Commission.)

DIXON, Thomas (Novelist and playwright. Born at Shelby, N. C., now living in New York City).

Foolish Virgin. Appleton (Sept.), 1915. \$1.35 net.

DODD, William Edward. (Born at Clayton, N. C. Professor American History, University of Chicago since 1908.)

Expansion and conflict (Riverside history of the U. S., Vol. 3). D. 329 p. Houghton, 1915. \$1.75 n.; school ed. \$1.25 net.

ERSKINE, Payne (Mrs. Charles Edwin Erskine). Well-known author.

Born in Wisconsin, living at Tryon, N. C.

Girl of the Blue Ridge. D. 401 p. Little. (Apr.) 1915. \$1.35 net.

FOERSTER, Norman (University of North Carolina).

Outlines and summaries; a handbook for analysis of expository essays. O. 105 p. Holt, 1915. Pap. 35 cents net.

FULTON, Maurice Garland, ed. (Professor Davidson College).

College life; its conditions and problems; a selection of essays for use in college writing courses. D. 524 p. Macmillan (Nov.), 1914. \$1.25 net.

GREENLAW, Edwin, ed. (Professor University of N. C.).

Familiar Letters; edited with introduction and notes. Scott-Foreman, 1915.

HARPER, William Allen (President Elon College).

Making of men. D. 173 p. Christian Pub. Assn. (May), 1915. 75 cents.

HECK, Fannie E. S. (Well known and greatly beloved church worker and club woman who died in Raleigh, August, 1915.)

Everyday gladness D. 93 p. Revell (Sept.), 1915. 50 cents net.

HECK, William Harry (Professor of Education, University of Virginia, since 1905.)

Studies of mental fatigue in relation to the daily school program. Ed. 2. O. 38 p. Bell, 1914. Gratis.

HENDERSON, Archibald. (Well known author. Professor University of N. C. since 1908.)

Modern drama and opera; reading lists on the works of various authors. Vol. 2: Introduction, "The Drama in America" and the bibliographies by Archibald Henderson. (Useful reference series, No. 13.) O. 255 p. Bost. Book Co. (July), 1915. \$2.00.

O. Henry; a memorial essay. 32 p. Mutual Pub. Co. (Dec.), 1914. 60 cents.

KEPHART, Horace, ed. (Born in Pennsylvania, but now living in Bryson City, N. C. Winner of the Patterson Cup in 1913.)

Captives among the Indians; first-hand narratives of Indians wars, customs, tortures and habits of life in colonial times. (Outing adventure Library, No. 3.) D. 240 p. Outing Pub. Co. (Feb.), 1915. \$1.00 net.

Castaways and Crusoes; tales of survivors of shipwreck in New Zealand, Patagonia, Tobago, South seas, etc. (Outing Adventure Library No. 2.) D. 294 p. Outing Pub. Co. (Feb.), 1915. \$1.00 net.

KNIGHT, Edgar W. (Department of Education, Trinity College.)

Some principles of teaching. Pilgrim press, 1915. 75 cents.

MORLEY, Margaret Warner. (Well known author born in the middle West now living at Tryon, N. C.)

Apple tree sprite. D. il. McClurg, 1915. \$1.10 net.

NASH, L. L. (Hamlet, N. C.)

Christian family. 24 p. Mutual Pub. Co., 1915. 50 cents.

POE, Clarence. (Author and editor.)

How farmers coöperate and double profits; first hand reports on all the leading forms of rural coöperation in the U. S. and Europe—stories that show how farmers coöperate by showing how they have done it and are doing it. D. 244 p. por. Judd, 1915. \$1.50 net.

POTTEAT, William Louis. (President Wake Forest College since 1905.)

New peace; lectures on science and religion. D. 150 p. Badger, 1915. \$1.00 net.

RIDDLE, C. B. (Elon College.)

Trailing the truth. D. 88 p. Southern Christian Pub. Co., 1914.

SMITH, Major W. A.

Anson guards; Company C., Fourteenth Regiment, North Carolina volunteers 1861-1865. D. 368 p. por. Stone Pub. Co., 1914.

SPRUNT, James. (Wilmington.)

Chronicles of the Cape Fear River; being some accounts of historic events on the Cape Fear River. Edwards & Broughton, 1914.

Studies in Southern History and Politics; inscribed to William Archibald Dunning . . . by his former pupils, the authors. O. 394.p. Columbia Univ. press., 1914. \$2.50 net.

Two of the 16 chapters are written by North Carolinians. Dr. William K. Boyd deals with the subject, "Some Phases of Educational History in the South" and Dr. J. G. De Roulhac Hamilton with "Southern Legislation in respect to Freedom."

TIERMAN, Mrs. Frances Christine Fisher (Christian Reid, pseud.), Salisbury, N. C.

Far-away princess. D. 406 p. Devin-Adair, 1914. \$1.35 net.

WEEKS, Stephen B. (Bureau of Education, Washington).

History of public education in Alabama. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1915, no. 12.

REPRINTS.

COLTON, Elizabeth Avery (Professor of English, Meredith College).

The Junior College problem in the South.

Reprinted from the proceedings of the Twentieth Annual meeting of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States.

HENDERSON, Archibald.

The American drama. 10 p. Reprinted from the Sewanee Review, October, 1915.

Richard Henderson and the occupation of Kentucky (1775), 22 p.

Reprinted from *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Dec., 1914.

The South's awakening: being the annual address before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Tulane University. 13 p.

Reprinted from the *Newcomb Arcade*, June, 1915.

KNIGHT, Edgar W. (Assistant Professor of Education, Trinity College.)

Peabody fund and its early operation in North Carolina.

Reprinted from *South Atlantic Quarterly*. Apr., 1915.

Some fallacies concerning the history of public education in the South.

Reprinted from the *South Atlantic Quarterly*. Oct., 1914.

CONTINUATIONS.

NORTH CAROLINA BOOKLET, January-October, 1915:

Volume 14, No. 3. The Creative Forces in Westward expansion: Henderson and Boone, by Archibald Henderson.—The old North State (Carolina), by Mrs. Julia E. Cain.—The Contributions of North Carolina to the Development of American Institutions, by Simeon E. Baldwin.—Sir Walter Raleigh as a Poet, by Nina Hollands Covington.—Biographical and Genealogical Memoranda.

Volume 14, No. 4. The fisheries of Eastern Carolina, by William J. Leary, Sr.—Fiscal and economic conditions in North Carolina during the Civil War, by William K. Boyd.—Was Esther Wake a myth? by R. D. W. Connor.—Colonel John Hinton, by Mary Hiliard Hinton.—Biographical and Genealogical Memoranda.

Volume 15, No. 1. Edward Strudwick, surgeon, by Hubert A. Royster.—Grace Greenlee, a Revolutionary heroine, by William Carson Ervin.—Number of North Carolinians in the Revolutionary War.—Was Lederer in Bertie County?—Historical Book Reviews.—Biographical.

Volume 15, No. 2. Secretaries of the Navy: John Branch, by Marshall DeLancey Haywood.—Our pre-revolutionary printers, by Dr. Stephen B. Weeks.—The First Fourth of July Celebration, by Adelaide Fries.

NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL COMMISSION:

North Carolina Manual, for the use of members of the General Assembly, session of 1915; compiled and edited by R. D. W. Connor. D. 356 p. Edwards & Broughton, 1915. Gratis.

NORTH CAROLINA YEAR BOOK AND BUSINESS DIRECTORY, 1915.

D. 496 p. map. *News and Observer*, 1915. \$2.

JAMES SPRUNT HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS, published under the direction of the N. C. Historical Society, edited by J. G. De Roulhac Hamilton and Henry M. Wagstaff. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina. Vol 13, No. 2.

STATE NORMAL AND INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE.

Historical publications. No. 3.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, published under the direction of the Philological Club of North Carolina. Vol. 12, Nos. 1-3.

TRINITY COLLEGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Historical papers. Series 11.

The *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *North Carolina Education*, *Skyland*, the *North Carolina Library Bulletin*, *Social Service Bulletin*, and the publications of the various colleges and universities have been issued regularly during the year.

A State Art Commission

BY WILLIAM C. A. HAMMEL.

It has been said that great nations write their autobiographies in three manuscripts—the books of their words, the books of their deeds, and the books of their art; that not one of these books can be understood unless we read the other two, but of the three the only one quite trustworthy is the last—the books of their art.

Zealous for facts, history leaves no stone of research unturned that a nation's great events and great lives may be faithfully recorded in her book of deeds. Vibrant with truth, literature sings the spirit of the times and of men and writes the songs in her immortal book of words. Devout high-priestess of the ideal, art consecrates herself to perfection, "to the doing of all things as well as it is possible that they can be done." The books of art are carvings and sculptures, pillars and pediments, temples, highways, homes, and gardens and all great and humble things for the use and admiration of man. With chisel and anvil, with wheel and loom, art stamps upon the pages of her book the records of the nation's conception of enduring beauty.

It was an ideal stronger than that inspiring martial deeds of history that built and left to posterity the Pyramids, the palaces of the Incas, the Taj Mahal, the temples at Angkor Wat, the Venus of Milo, the Victory of Samothrace, the bronze doors of the baptistry at Florence, the vases of Pompeii, the tapestries of the Gobelins. The real glory that was Greece and the real grandeur that was Rome are still alive in the ideals which their crumbling remnants inspire. The written records of their civilizations may not always be incontestable, but the architectural relics of these civilizations tell a story that all the world may read.

Young and untutored, America has but just begun to write her autobiography. A brief past in a new traditionless land has left but few marks in any but her book of deeds. As historical societies take stock of these past accomplishments, a patriotic pride fires them to a laudable desire to mark the stepping stones of the nation's progress through deeds of prowess, to memorialize in some lasting visible form the men and the events that made the nation and builded the Commonwealth,

"to set a votive stone
That memory may their deed redeem,
When, like our sires, our sons are gone."

And so has sprung up a veritable forest of monuments, statues, arches, and other memorial tributes. The nation's capital abounds in such me-

monials. State capitals everywhere view with pride these decorative features of the capitol grounds. Every battlefield, headquarters, birth-place, is already marked or awaits early recognition. Every little town that boasts a historic event or an authentic founder is thrilled with the enterprise of raising funds or donating sites for monuments. Patriotic societies everywhere claim it as their right as well as their sacred privilege to work themselves to death that their heroes may be deathless in the minds and hearts of the people.

But the result of all this beautiful patriotism has not always been a happy one for the equally worthy and equally immortal cause of art. Equestrian statues with tons of bronze horses balanced upon a flowing bronze tail, "rocking-horse Jacksons," frock-coated specimens of attempts at portraiture in bronze, marble effigies mercifully disintegrating day by day, symbolical groups that symbolize nothing but misspent money—these have increased and multiplied and filled our public squares and crowded round our public buildings, frightening us into remorse instead of thrilling us with admiration for the artist-brain that conceived them, with "solemn pride" in the men and deeds which they commemorate, and with impulses of undying patriotism.

The years of unrestrained freedom in the acceptance no less than in the bestowal of these well-meant honors to the distinguished dead, have left to the living public a large legacy of regrets and disappointments, and shocked it finally into protest, into a demand for protection in the future through some authorized legal means of regulating the design and the emplacement of all works of art destined to belong to the public or to be erected upon public grounds.

Many cities and a few of the states have already openly resented the debasement of public taste, and, through their city councils and legislatures, have taken refuge in the establishment of municipal and state art commissions whose duty it is to help prevent future mistakes by passing upon the design and the location of all such works of art before their acceptance.

One of the first of these commissions, which was established in a great city of the North, declared itself as "only heading off the dullness, the crudities, the vulgarities, and the monstrosities that worthy organizations, inspired by noble sentiments, but whose inspirations ended there, were continually foisting upon the city in localities that made the balefulness of the abortions so much the more conspicuous."

Frederick W. Coburn, an art critic of note, writes: "The memorial of patriotic achievement has not been expected to look its part of inspiration and aspiration. It has stood usually for the crassest philistinism, the negation of nobility. Factories, warehouses and business blocks

appear to be honest and dignified works of art by contrast with the cheap meretriciousness of the local soldiers' monument."

Writing editorially in the *Southern Woman's Magazine*, Anne P. Rankin deploras "that we could not have remembered in the midst of the hard days of poverty and tears that followed our great war that the history the South has made was deathless enough to wait for a saner and more serene time for the memorials we were to build to it. A monument once erected is persistently and inevitably permanent. There is something so deep and vital in the zeal and self-sacrifice that erect these tributes that we may not countenance the thought of laying violent hands on them however much they deface the landscape or harass the vision. And too often, alas! we have allowed our love and enthusiasm to outrun both pecuniary ability and good taste. Over and over again we have given both tears and toil to perpetuate in uncouth and cheap memorials a story that already of its own heroism and tragedy had builded for itself a monument more enduring than brass."

It is comforting to know that memorial art in the South is soon to be redeemed in some measure by the project of the Daughters of the Confederacy to memorialize the lost cause by depicting heroes and scenes of the war in colossal figures to be carved in the living rock on the sheer side of Stone Mountain near Atlanta. The Daughters have enlisted the services of Gutzon Borglum, one of America's most noteworthy sculptors, who outlines his scheme in a recent issue of the *Atlanta Constitution*. The artist is filled with enthusiasm over the plan and declares it the most wonderful thing in the world.

North Carolina could hardly have a stronger plea for the establishment of an art commission that might regulate memorial art than the argument voiced in these words of one of her most public-spirited citizens: "There is within a few hundred yards of where I write a monument to Our Confederate Dead which cost, I believe, \$25,000 in 1895, or the equivalent of \$50,000 now. The good women of the State with devotion and self-sacrifice that should have eventuated in a far more beautiful result, gave of their means and the men gave of theirs in a period of dire poverty, the spirit of it all being beautiful and touching. And what is the result? A mere pile of stone, which, I suppose, has never made anybody's heart beat faster or given any child a vision of the spirit, heroism and pathos of our Civil War period. And yet I doubt whether our people did not spend just as much money and give just as much labor of heart and hand to erect this memorial as the people of Switzerland gave when their efforts under the happier direction of a great artist-mind resulted in the creation of the unforgettable Lion of Lucerne, which has been the admiration of visitors from all

quarters of the earth and gives every one who sees it a poetic realization of the sublimity of the deeds it was meant to immortalize."

So from all sides come criticisms and protests.

You who have the historic monuments of the state in comprehensive array in your minds, review the occasions these monuments commemorate. Estimate, if you can, the sentiment, the labor, the hard-won subscriptions that erected them. How many of these memorials are worthy in any sense? Of how many could we pray with the poet of Concord—

"Spirit, that made these heroes dare
To die * * *
Bid Time and Nature gently spare
The shaft we raise to them and thee."

On the other hand, how many, could they have been foreseen by their heroes, would not have added "a new terror to death"?

Of those that are in themselves of artistic merit, how many stand in reposeful simplicity, in proper relation to their surroundings whether architectural or landscape background? How many produce that "unified impressiveness" which should belong to a public monument? Of the designers of these monuments how many had ever visited their sites or knew where or how their works were to be placed.

St. Gaudens, when the question of the site of that wonderful masterpiece dedicated to a Northern general was under consideration, "explored available ground in a passion of anxiety, and the one thing that he was forever urging was that the monument should be in some big quiet scene on a site spacious enough for him to be sure of a simple background." Such is the "passion of anxiety" of a great artist. No such anxiety has troubled us. All we have asked for usually is the most conspicuous place possible for our memorial—and, pity 'tis, we have usually got it.

If we had these things to do over again on limited resources would we not be content in most cases to place upon the site which we have appropriated, a tree, or a fountain to cheer dusty travelers and toilers, or choose, perhaps, a different site and dedicate it, in the name of our hero, to the sport and recreation of childhood, or at the most set up a simple tablet whose dignified inscription would tell all and more than an ill-wrought colossal bronze figure could do.

How well these words engraved upon the Nathanael Greene monument at Guilford Battle Ground tell the meaning of the monument. And how confidently, moreover, do they presuppose that the sculptor's work in bronze and marble is as soul-stirring as the words:

"A grateful nation erects this monument, as an expression of its solemn pride in the men who fought here, of its imperishable devotion to their memory, and of its unalterable confidence in the permanence of the principles which their example vindicated."

In our zeal for our cause and for its perpetuation "in eternal memory" we have gone so far ahead of our means and have so sadly fallen short of our ideals. We are "grand and gloomy and peculiar," and make monuments that are very big, very expensive, and yet not monumental after all.

What a long step forward it would be to our credit, to the glory of the departed, and to the advancement of memorial art in our country, if we could take to heart the suggestion of Royal Cortissoz: "It will be a fine day for American sculpture," he says, "when some sagacious committee, setting its face like flint against a full-length in bronze of the local patriot (whom he has never seen) to be set up on a mass of granite in a public square, will go to one of our sculptors and say to him, 'Put your imagination to work. Give us an image of beauty, embodying some interesting idea. Then let us consider together where it may best be placed, so that it will add to the happiness of the whole community, and you shall have your reward.'"

It is such "sagacious committees" as this that should have authority over all public art. Realizing this, four states and at least eighteen cities, and the Federal Government itself, have, since 1898, through their legislatures, through their city councils, and through Congress, established art commissions, which are varied in purpose and scope according to local needs, though their general function is practically the same in all cases.

Technically, the function of an art commission is to criticise, to act as a jury, to pass upon plans and designs submitted, but not to forecast or to take the initiative, as does for example a city planning commission. The power to visualize inheres in both, but the art commission must have power to visualize the result of the execution of a definite plan for a definite structure. It passes upon plans to be used immediately. It may reject any and all plans submitted, if not judged suitable, but it should have no power to prepare plans in place of those disapproved. It is critical in its attitude, not creative; a jury merely to approve or disapprove the æsthetic qualities of a design. Consideration of the cost of the work of art to be selected is not included in the functions of an art commission, though it has been found almost invariably that the commission's judgment effects an actual saving in dollars and cents.

Some idea of the individual reasons for being and of the scope and membership of art commissions already established may be gained from a brief account of a few of the characteristic commissions.

The first was the Boston Art Commission. Its establishment in 1898 grew out of the protest of an aroused public opinion against the placing of an inartistic statue in the Public Garden to commemorate the deeds of a Massachusetts hero of the War Between the States. The first matter submitted to the newly appointed commission was the removal of the stone image and the erection of a bronze work of art in its stead. It is strictly a municipal commission and has no jurisdiction over state buildings and state property within its borders. The five members must be citizens of Boston, and are appointed as follows: One from a list of three persons selected by the trustees of the Museum of Fine Arts, one from a list of three persons selected by the trustees of the Boston Public Library, one from a list of three persons selected by the Boston Art Club, and one from a list of three persons selected by the Society of Architects.

The Boston laws seem to have become a model for other municipal commissions, and in a measure for state art commissions. They provide that no work of art shall become the property of Boston by purchase, gift or otherwise unless such work of art or the design for the same, together with a statement of the proposed location of the same shall first have been submitted to and approved by a majority of its members; and that no work of art shall, until so approved, be erected or placed in, over, or upon or allowed to extend in, over, or upon any street, avenue, square, place, common, park, municipal building or other public place under the control of said city or any department or officer thereof, and that no existing work of art in possession of said city shall be removed, relocated, or altered in any way without approval of said commission.

The term "work of art," as used in this act (and so accepted in all commissions) shall apply to and include all paintings, decorations, statues, bas-reliefs, sculptures, monuments, fountains, arches, ornamental gateways, and other structures of a permanent character intended for ornament or commemoration.

New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Charleston, Cleveland, Jersey City, and Newark, Los Angeles, Pittsburg, Denver, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Haven, Yonkers, Mount Vernon, N. Y., have practically the same laws as Boston, adapted to local conditions. The appointment of membership varies, some cities requiring that among the members shall be one sculptor, one painter, and one architect. In all, with the exception of Cleveland, the members of these art com-

missions serve without compensation. Cleveland's commission is, properly speaking, a city planning commission, with a director of public service, who employs three assistants at a salary of \$5,000 each.

The gradual extension in the power and scope of these municipal commissions, due to manifestation of ability and efficiency, is instanced in the case of the Art Commission of the City of New York. From merely passing upon the designs of public buildings only at the mayor's request, it has now come to be required by law to pass upon all public buildings, and all private buildings, built on public land. In New York in 1910 the 179 submissions considered by the city art commission involved about \$43,000,000. The small cost to the city for expert advice on these designs is out of all proportion to the magnitude of the benefit to the city. The total cost to the city of Philadelphia for its art commission in 1908, covering 45 submissions, amounting to over nine million dollars was less than \$4,000.

The Federal Art Commission, or the National Commission of Fine Arts, is purely an advisory body, upon no condition is it supposed to take the initiative. It is composed of men not only of capability as artists but of wide reputation. It stands as the court of last resort in expert knowledge. Its duty is to advise upon the location of statues, fountains, and monuments in the public squares, streets, and parks of the District of Columbia, and upon the selection of models for statues, fountains, and monuments erected under the authority of the United States, and upon the selection of artists for the execution of the same.

In its first year the National Commission of Fine Arts had referred to it 45 cases, of which 41 were considered and disposed of, the total amount of money involved in these being \$16,000,000. Among the more important of these submissions were the site for the proposed Lincoln Memorial (decided upon before the design for the memorial was accepted), the models for the monuments to John Paul Jones and Commodore John Barry, to be erected in Washington, the designs for the new buildings for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and Labor, for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Washington City Postoffice, as well as certain paintings privately recommended to Congress for purchase. The Government appropriates \$10,000 annually for the use of this commission.

While municipal commissions are somewhat similar in their power and scope, the few state commissions established thus far exhibit more individuality of scheme.

The Art Commission of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts acts in an advisory capacity relative to the creation, acquisition, construction, erection, or removal of any work of art, and the artistic character of

any building constructed by the commonwealth upon lands owned by the commonwealth. The term building includes bridges, arches, gates, walls or other permanent structure. The members serve without compensation.

When the Massachusetts Legislature in 1910 appointed the State Art Commission it granted the power to all cities and towns in the state to establish commissions whenever desired, and the same act regulated the method of appointment and all details so that no difficulties or delay of organization would be necessary.

Connecticut has a State Capitol Commission of Sculpture, to which is referred all matters relating to the decoration of the capitol buildings and grounds with historical statues or works of art. It grants no compensations to members but appropriates \$5,000 annually to be expended in the work of thus completing the exterior of the capitol building.

Minnesota, in its conception of the power, scope and functions of an art commission, is broader and more generous than any of the other states. The enactment of the law which twelve years ago made the commission effective was due to the efforts of the Federated Women's Clubs of Minnesota. The Minnesota State Art Commission has received state aid through an annual appropriation of \$7,500, which, unfortunately, has been withdrawn this year, through the vagaries of politics. This fund has been augmented yearly by voluntary subscriptions and by the membership fees of the Minnesota State Art Society, of which the State Art Commission is the governing board. The membership of this governing board consists of nine members, seven of whom are appointed by the governor from lists of names proposed by the Fine Arts Society of Minneapolis, the Art Workers' Guild of St. Paul, and the Art Committee of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs. Four are artists or connoisseurs of art, one an architect, one prominently identified with education, and one directly interested in the manufactures.

The general object of this Commission is "to advance the interests of the fine arts, to develop the influence of art in education, and to foster the introduction of art in the manufactures." These it seeks to accomplish by sending out through the state, exhibitions of representative modern paintings, sculptures and applied art; by loaning or supplying collections of art prints and reproductions to schools, clubs and libraries; by sending experienced lecturers into all parts of the state; by cooperating with the State Library Commission in circulating traveling libraries of books relating to art; by publishing a magazine devoted to the individual, the home, and the community; by giving expert advice on designs

for civic centers, parks, town halls, school buildings, town plans, gardens and memorials; by developing and providing a market for industries—such as lace-making—founded upon the arts and crafts brought by many of her people from the old country.

One of the latest and most important of the activities of the Minnesota Art Commission is the Model Farm House Competition, opened to all architects and designers in the state. The commission invited farmers to formulate the requirements and specifications for an efficient farm house to cost \$3,500. When all the plans had been submitted by competitors the award was made by a farmer, a teacher of home economics, and an architect. Cash prizes were awarded, the prize-winning designs and plans published, and placed at the service of any farmer wishing to build. The first prize model farm home, full size and completely furnished was one of the attractions at the State Fair this year. A model barn was built also and the State Forestry Department provided a model farmyard, showing plants and hardy foliage suitable for Minnesota. From one plan will be built on the grounds of the Agricultural College a farm house for which the students are to plan and carry out incidental decorations and furnishings, and the girl students will occupy the house in groups, making practical demonstrations of work in domestic science. Competitions for model city houses, village houses and bungalows have also been held.

While enriching the lives of her people by bringing to them the fine arts, Minnesota is at the same time instilling in them a sense of the art possible in common things, and is not overlooking the value of such art as an economic as well as an æsthetic asset of the state.

In 1913 a conference of members of all the then existing art commissions was held in New York. The time was spent in the consideration of "practical questions related to the proper functions and powers of art commissions and were directed not so much to the art commissions already existing, as to the art commissions still to be formed in the future for cities and states, in which their organization was beginning to be considered. The delegates gave their deliberations a practical result by farming proposed legislation for the organization of future art commissions both city and state."

The form of an act to establish a state art commission as thus framed practically covers, besides the power and scope of such a commission, all general matters relating to membership, compensation, employment, salary, and office of secretary, and expenses of the commission in the performance of official duties.

With the precedent of art commissions already in successful operation, and with model legislative plans framed by their representatives, it

wants but a step to the establishment of a State Art Commission in North Carolina. That step is the appointment by the State Literary and Historical Association of a legislative committee looking to the earliest possible legislative action.

It is most fitting that this movement should have its inception in the State Literary and Historical Association, because the state of North Carolina is rich, not only in men and events, both literary and historical, worth commemorating, but also in the sort of patriotism that seeks to commemorate them; because the sacrifices that must needs be made to effect these commemorations ought to be more worthily rewarded in the admiring regard and gratitude of future generations; and not least because the status, development and growth of a people are read as well in their works of art as in their written records.

Originated primarily to atone for the wrongs done in the name of patriotism and of art, and awake to the fact that a dead and gone hero is not the only reason for a work of art, the State Art Commission might eventually broaden its scope to have jurisdiction over the architecture and grouping of State buildings and the landscape architecture of their grounds; over water-fronts, parks, highways, bridges, and any other phase of public construction, whether utilitarian, ornamental, or commemorative.

There is abundant evidence in all the States of the need of regulation in the architecture of groups of State buildings, where in one group may appear as many different styles of architecture as there are single buildings, ranging from Romanesque to Moorish, from Colonial to craftsman, from conventional to nondescript.

In some of the earlier groups the purely functional, sincere plainness of the first buildings at least contributes to a dignified uniformity, its severity softened by the ancient arching trees. When into the midst of such a group is obtruded as an Alumnae Memorial—save the mark—a gigantic assembly hall, whose acoustics are so faulty as to prevent the hall's being even functional, and whose architecture is the superlative of the anomalous and the ugly—the result is a tragedy that cannot be atoned for.

The University of Virginia is fortunate in having been able to carry out, in recently added buildings, plans in perfect harmony of architectural and landscape scheme with those of its noted founder.

The Johns Hopkins University has set an example in consistently modeling the architecture of all its group after the perfect specimen of the colonial style, found in the old manor house standing in the midst of Homewood estate, now the newly acquired campus.

And yet, only a few miles from the Hopkins has been erected a group of state buildings in an architectural style, and of a material, entirely unrelated to anything in the locality or in the state, the architect and the building committee missing a choice opportunity in art and economy to pattern the buildings after the majestic style of an old courthouse nearby, built many years ago of the stone from a local quarry, still in operation. A state art commission would have made a disinterested study of the case and have considered all artistic possibilities before plans were accepted, the contract given, and the buildings set as they are on a treeless plot on the side of the broad highway, when a sixty-acre grove of handsome trees was available on the same estate and would have furnished an ideal setting.

In time, North Carolina, with its great rural population, might, like Minnesota, come to claim the judgment of the state art commission in the planning of farm-homes. There is no reason why the farm-homes of today should not express as artistically the rural life of today as, on a more magnificent scale, Shirley, Brandon, and Mount Vernon express the plantation life of the unique civilization that characterized *ante-bellum* days.

Then, too, while waiting for new worlds to conquer, an art commission might profitably use its authority to preserve from destruction and to restore what is already of artistic merit, as the women of Salisbury have so wisely done in the case of the old courthouse, which they have taken over to use as a community building.

But at first it will be necessary and judicious to progress slowly. It is important first of all to get the public used to the idea of an art commission, so that the recognition of each new need for its service may find fruition in the sanction of the law-making body. And then again, at each new step the public must be carried along, must recognize the advantages gained—and the pace may not always be a rapid one.

After the State Art Commission has once been established much can be done to spread a knowledge of its existence and its duties by coöperation with the civic societies, women's clubs, teachers' associations, the patriotic societies, and other organizations working for betterment throughout the state. Even in its infancy the commission might be a clearing house for the art activities of the state, lending a helping hand in all pertinent matters, itself conferring, when necessary, with recognized artists outside its own membership, either within or without the state.

The all-important thing is to establish an art commission. Leslie W. Miller of the Philadelphia Art Jury, speaking before the National Conference of Art Commissions, before referred to, said: "I want you to

remember that it is not the way in which the commission is appointed, it is not in rules and regulations, or particular powers, that essentials are to be found. The essential thing is the recognition of the principle that it is the business of the public everywhere to recognize the principle that in the ordering of its public affairs, in the treatment of public places, in the construction of public buildings, and the erection of public monuments of every kind to see to it that from this time forward the artistic principle, the æsthetic aim, shall not be overlooked. That is the essential thing."

On whatever terms an art commission may be established, there is little doubt that the possibilities of ever-increasing advantage will become more and more apparent, and that the Art Commission of the State of North Carolina will prove itself an indispensable part of the government of the state.

Members, 1915-1916

ABERDEEN.

Henry A. Page.

AMPEEE, N. J.

R. C. Petty.

ANSONVILLE.

Maj. W. A. Smith.

ASHEVILLE.

Junius G. Adams.

S. Westray Battle.

Col. R. Bingham.

Louis M. Bourne.

C. J. Harris.

F. R. Hewett.

Mrs. T. F. Malloy.

Julius C. Martin.

Normal and Collegiate Institute.

Haywood Parker.

Mrs. Chas. M. Platt.

Miss Florence Stephenson.

R. R. Williams.

Dr. George T. Winston.

ATLANTA.

Lindsey Hopkins.

AURORA.

Miss Lottie H. Bonner.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Bruce Cotten.

BARIUM SPRINGS.

William Laurie Hill.

BILTMORE.

Mrs. Arthur F. Rees.

BOSTON, MASS.

Mrs. W. H. Potter.

BRUCE.

Mrs. R. R. Cotten.

CARY.

M. B. Dry.

CHAPEL HILL.

Dr. Kemp P. Battle.

Collier Cobb.

Mrs. J. W. Gore.

Dr. E. K. Graham.

Dr. Edwin Greenlaw.

Dr. J. G. deR. Hamilton.

Dr. Archibald Henderson.

E. V. Howell.

Dr. Joseph Hyde Pratt.

Dr. Francis P. Venable.

N. W. Walker.

Dr. H. V. Wilson.

Dr. Louis R. Wilson.

CHARLOTTE.

Charles L. Alexander.

Miss Julia Alexander.

Miss Violet Alexander.

A. G. Brenizer.

John L. Caldwell.

John L. Chambers.

Mrs. E. M. Cole.

Mrs. I. W. Faison.

Mrs. J. A. Fore.

Mrs. C. C. Hook.

Wm. Latimer.

F. B. McDowell.

Mrs. F. B. McDowell.

Miss Bertha Morris.

H. N. Pharr.

George Stephens.

Charles S. Stone.

Mrs. John Van Landingham.

Mrs. W. W. Watt.

W. W. Watt.

J. Frank Wilkes.

Miss Ella Young.

CLAYTON.

Mrs. Hardee Horne.

CLINTON.

R. E. Faison.

COLUMBIA.

Mark Majette.

COLUMBIA, TENN.

H. A. Brown.

DALLAS, TEX.

Mrs. Leslie B. Clark.

NOTE—Unless otherwise indicated, all postoffices are in North Carolina.

DAVIDSON.

Dr. Thomas W. Lingle.
Dr. J. M. McConnell.
Miss Cornelia Shaw.

DURHAM.

E. C. Brooks.
Gen. Julian S. Carr.
W. F. Carr.
Mrs. Ellen Constable.
H. L. Dalton.
Mrs. Sadie Smedes Erwin.
R. O. Everett.
P. G. Farrar.
Dr. W. P. Few.
W. W. Flowers.
T. B. Fuller.
Dr. William H. Glasson.
John Sprunt Hill.
Dr. Edgar W. Knight.
Dr. W. T. Laprade.
Mrs. Elizabeth Leak.
S. W. Minor.
E. K. Powe.
J. H. Southgate.
George W. Watts.

EDENTON.

R. H. Bachman.
Rev. R. B. Drane.
Mrs. Patrick Mathew.
W. D. Pruden.
Frank Wood.
J. G. Wood.

ELIZABETH CITY.

E. F. Aydlett.
H. T. Greenleaf, Sr.
M. T. Plyler.

ENFIELD.

Mrs. E. L. Whitehead.

FAYETTEVILLE.

J. H. Currie.
E. J. Hale.
Charles C. McAlister.

FRANKLINTON.

H. E. Craven.

GALLATIN, TENN.

Mrs. C. P. Horton.

GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

Hon. Walter Page.

GARYSBURG.

Capt. T. W. Mason.

GOLDSBORO.

Hon. F. A. Daniels.
G. A. Norwood.
George C. Royall.
Miss Gertrude Weil.

GRAHAM.

L. Banks Holt.

GREENVILLE.

Miss Sallie Joyner Davis.
Miss Lelia S. Higgs.
Miss Marguerite A. Higgs.
Miss Mamie E. Jenkins.
Col. Harry Skinner.
Miss Daisy B. Waitt.
Robert H. Wright.

GREENSBORO.

W. P. Beall.
Hon. W. P. Bynum.
Ceasar Cone.
R. D. Douglas.
R. M. Douglas.
Dr. J. I. Foust.
W. C. A. Hammell.
W. C. Jackson.
Robert R. King.
J. Van Lindley.
Miss Annie F. Petty.
A. M. Scales.
Paul W. Schenck.
Miss Gertrude Sousley.
Hon. Charles M. Stedman.
Chas. L. Van Noppen.
J. Norman Wills.

GUILFORD COLLEGE.

Dr. L. L. Hobbs.
Miss Julia S. White.

HAW RIVER.

A. W. Haywood.

HENDERSON,

T. M. Pittman.
Miss Esther Royster.
F. C. Toepleman.

HICKORY.

M. E. Thornton.

HIGH POINT.

W. J. Armfield.

J. Elwood Cox.

HILLSBORO.

Miss Rebecca Cameron.

Mrs. G. P. Collins.

Frank Nash.

KINSTON.

Mrs. L. V. Archbell.

G. V. Cowper.

Dr. Ira M. Hardy.

Mrs. W. T. Hines.

KITTRELL.

O. W. Blacknall.

LENOIR.

Edmund Jones.

Hon. W. C. Newland.

Miss Susan E. Hall.

LEXINGTON.

Wade H. Phillips.

Zeb B. Walser.

LIBERTY.

W. H. Albright.

LOUISBURG.

Miss Elizabeth A. Allen.

Ivey Allen.

William H. Ruffin.

LUMBERTON.

A. W. McLean.

L. R. Varser.

MARION.

R. L. Greenlea.

I. C. Griffin.

J. W. Winborne.

MARS HILL.

Miss Ethel English.

MAXTON.

Miss Kate McA. Watson.

MOCKSVILLE.

E. L. Gaither.

MONCURE.

J. H. Wisler.

MOORESVILLE.

Mrs. George C. Goodman.

MORGANTON.

Mrs. J. E. Erwin.

MOUNT AIRY.

Miss Isabel Graves.

Mrs. R. L. Penn.

Miss Irene L. Thompson.

MURFREESBORO.

Hon. B. B. Winborne.

NEW BERN.

J. B. Blades.

Miss Bessie C. Carman.

D. L. Ward.

NEW YORK CITY.

George Gordon Battle.

Dr. H. H. Horne.

Mrs. J. W. Miller.

NORFOLK, VA.

W. D. Pender.

NORTH WILKESBORO.

Mrs. Gordon Hackett.

OLD FORT.

Miss Lennie Greenlee.

OXFORD.

Mrs. H. C. Pinnix.

PALMYRA.

Mrs. B. B. Everett.

PINEHURST.

W. C. Jones.

PITTSBORO.

Maj. H. A. London.

Mrs. H. A. London.

PORTSMOUTH, VA.

Miss May W. Cobb.

RALEIGH.

Dr. Albert Anderson.

A. B. Andrews, Jr.

Phil H. Andrews.

W. J. Andrews.
Mrs. W. J. Andrews.
Capt. S. A. Ashe.
Mrs. C. B. Aycock.
Mrs. A. L. Baker.
Jesse G. Ball.
Rev. M. A. Barber.
Miss Blanch Barrus.
Dr. Kemp P. Battle, Jr.
A. P. Bauman.
E. C. Beddingfield.
Hon. T. W. Bickett.
Mrs. T. W. Bickett.
J. Crawford Biggs.
Miss Mary S. Birdsong.
Warren H. Booker.
J. D. Boushall.
John H. Boushall.
Miss Elizabeth Briggs.
Mrs. T. H. Briggs.
T. H. Briggs.
W. G. Briggs.
L. C. Brogden.
Hon. Geo. H. Brown.
Joseph G. Brown.
Mrs. Charles Busbee.
T. H. Calvert.
Dr. E. Delia Dixon-Carroll.
Rt. Rev. Jos. B. Cheshire.
Mrs. Joseph B. Cheshire.
Joseph B. Cheshire, Jr.
Hon. Walter Clark.
Mrs. Will X. Coley.
Miss E. A. Colton.
R. D. W. Connor.
Mrs. A. D. Cooper.
Mrs. J. M. Costner.
J. M. Costner.
Mrs. L. E. Covington.
B. G. Cowper.
Albert L. Cox.
Hon. Locke Craig.
W. C. Cram.
W. C. Cram, Jr.
Miss Flora Creech.
E. B. Crow.
Ernest Cruikshank.
E. E. Culbreth.
Josephus Daniels.
Miss May Hill Davis.
Miss Penelope Davis.

Miss Daisy Denson.
Mrs. E. C. Duncan.
E. C. Duncan.
Baxter Durham.
Mrs. Jesse P. Ernsshaw.
Rev. J. S. Farmer.
Alex J. Feild.
Mrs. W. J. Ferrall.
J. L. Fountain.
Mrs. J. L. Fountain.
Maj. W. A. Graham.
Col. J. Bryan Grimes.
Miss Sophie M. Grimes.
W. B. Grimes.
Miss Ruth Hannah.
F. M. Harper.
Dr. Thomas P. Harrison.
Mrs. Thomas P. Harrison.
Ernest Haywood.
F. P. Haywood.
M. DeL. Haywood.
Leo D. Heartt.
Miss Kate Herring.
Henry T. Hicks.
Dr. D. H. Hill.
Mrs. J. W. Hinsdale.
Miss Mary Hilliard Hinton.
Hon. W. A. Hoke.
Rev. A. B. Hunter.
Carey J. Hunter.
Mrs. Carey J. Hunter.
Rufus J. Hunter.
B. S. Jerman.
Col. Charles E. Johnson.
Mrs. Charles E. Johnson.
Clarence A. Johnson.
Mrs. Clarence A. Johnson.
Miss Lizzie P. Jones.
Miss Lovie Jones.
W. N. Jones.
J. Y. Joyner.
Mrs. Thomas S. Kenan.
Rev. George W. Lay.
Mrs. George W. Lay.
Miss Minnie W. Leatherman.
Mrs. Paul H. Lee.
Miss Annie Lewis.
Dr. R. H. Lewis.
Mrs. R. H. Lewis.
J. S. Mann.
W. F. Marshall.

Dr. Charles F. Meserve.
 Z. P. Metcalf.
 Hon. W. A. Montgomery.
 Rev. H. C. Moore.
 Mrs. Ruth H. Moore.
 Miss Mary Moran.
 Mrs. Ellen Mordecai.
 F. O. Moring.
 Mrs. F. O. Moring.
 Hugh Morson.
 N. C. Newbold.
 Mrs. M. T. Norris.
 Rev. T. W. O'Kelly.
 Charles J. Parker.
 Miss Rosa Paschal.
 W. J. Peele.
 Miss Emma Peet.
 E. F. Pescud.
 Rev. I. McK. Pittenger.
 Clarence Poe.
 Mrs. Clarence Poe.
 Miss Eliza Pool.
 Miss Ida Poteat.
 Dr. George J. Ramsey.
 Mrs. R. B. Raney.
 Dr. W. S. Rankin.
 John E. Ray.
 W. T. Reaves.
 Miss Mattie Reese.
 W. C. Riddick.
 Charles Root.
 G. Rosenthal.
 Miss Edith Royster.
 Dr. H. A. Royster.
 Miss Mary A. Schenck.
 S. Brown Shepherd.
 Capt. M. O. Sherrill.
 Mrs. M. B. Sherwood.
 Mrs. M. B. Shipp.
 Dr. Charles Lee Smith.
 Ed. Chambers Smith.
 Mrs. Ed. Chambers Smith.
 Miss Mary Shannon Smith.
 J. F. Stanback.
 Mrs. J. F. Stanback.
 Miss Alma I. Stone.
 W. E. Stone.
 Dr. George Summey, Jr.
 Mrs. E. E. Swindell.
 Mrs. Andrew Syme.

Mrs. M. B. Terrell.
 Julian B. Timberlake.
 Mrs. V. E. Turner.
 Rev. R. T. Vann.
 W. W. Vass.
 Mrs. W. W. Vass.
 Hon. Platt D. Walker.
 William H. Williamson.
 Mrs. William H. Williamson.
 Mrs. J. M. Winfree.
 Robert W. Winston.
 W. A. Withers.
 Miss Ada V. Womble.
 Col. W. P. Wood.
 A. H. Yerby.
 J. R. Young.
 Miss S. E. Young.

REIDSVILLE.

Mrs. Eugene Irvin.

RICHMOND, VA.

Dr. J. Allison Hodges.
 Mrs. H. W. Jackson.
 Mrs. E. E. Moffitt.
 Henry Litchford.
 Rev. W. W. Moore.

RICH SQUARE.

Andrew J. Conner.

ROCKY MOUNT.

Jacob Battle.
 Thomas H. Battle.
 J. C. Braswell.
 R. H. Ricks.

ROXBORO.

Mrs. J. A. Long, Sr.

RUTHERFORDTON.

Solomon Gallert.

SALISBURY.

Eugene H. Bean.
 W. C. Coughenour.
 John S. Henderson.
 Stahl Linn.
 J. S. McCubbins.
 Mrs. Mamie G. McCubbins.
 Mrs. James P. Moore.
 Hon. Lee S. Overman.
 James H. Ramsey.

SANFORD.

William Cain Jones.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Josiah Collins.

SMITHFIELD.

T. J. Lassiter.

SPRAY.

Mrs. B. Frank Mebane.

Hon. John M. Morehead.

Mrs. John M. Morehead.

STATESVILLE.

Mrs. D. M. Ansley.

Mrs. A. D. Cooper.

D. Matt Thompson.

SOUTHPORT.

C. L. Stevens.

Mrs. C. L. Stevens.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.

Miss Carolina M. Brevard.

TARBORO.

Col. J. L. Bridgers.

Mrs. Jackie D. Thrash.

TOWNESVILLE.

J. M. B. Hunt.

URBANA, ILL.

Mrs. F. L. Stevens.

UNIVERSITY, VA.

Dr. C. Alphonso Smith.

WAKE FOREST.

J. Henry Highsmith.

R. P. McCutcheon.

Miss Minnie Mills.

Helen Poteat.

Dr. Hubert Poteat.

Dr. W. L. Poteat.

Mrs. W. L. Poteat.

WANANISH.

Kinchen B. Council.

WARRENTON.

Tasker Polk.

WASHINGTON.

Hon. Stephen Bragaw.

J. E. Clark.

Mrs. S. R. Fowle.

Miss Lida T. Rodman.

Hon. J. H. Small.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Miss Bessie Black.

Hon. P. P. Claxton.

B. J. Johnson.

W. H. Osborn.

WAYNESVILLE.

G. S. Ferguson.

WELDON.

W. E. Daniel.

WHITAKERS.

Dr. R. H. Speight.

WHITSETT.

Dr. W. T. Whitsett.

WILLIAMSTON.

Col. Wilson G. Lamb.

WILSON.

Col. J. F. Bruton.

Mrs. J. F. Bruton.

J. Dempsey Bullock.

Hon. H. G. Connor.

Mrs. H. G. Connor.

Charles L. Coon.

John D. Gold.

Jonas Oettinger.

Mrs. F. A. Woodard.

WILMINGTON.

Edward P. Bailey.

John D. Bellamy.

J. J. Blair.

J. O. Carr.

Mrs. R. L. Cobb.

W. J. Craig.

Mrs. W. M. Creasy.

W. M. Cumming.

Junius Davis.

Thomas W. Davis.

Theo G. Empie.

H. G. Foard.

Clayton Gles.

B. F. Hall.

Miss Susan E. Hall.

J. G. McCormick.

W. B. McKoy.

Donald McRae.
H. W. Malloy.
Miss Lucile W. Murchison.
Eric Norden.
Mrs. Richard Price.
George Rountree.
James Sprunt.
W. H. Sprunt.
M. S. Willard.

WINDSOR.

Hon. Francis D. Winston.

WINSTON-SALEM.

Dr. Henry T. Bahnson.
Mrs. Henry T. Bahnson.

William A. Blair.
M. L. Erwin.
Mrs. M. F. P. Fearington.
Miss Adelaide Fries.
Col. H. E. Fries.
Mrs. Lindsay Patterson.
Wm. S. Pfohl.
Mrs. R. J. Reynolds.
Mrs. W. N. Reynolds.
J. Hampton Rich.
Rt. Rev. Edward Rondthaler.
Rev. Howard Rondthaler.
Miss C. L. Shaffner.
Mrs. W. O. Spencer.
Wachovia Historical Society.

